

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1958

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 24, 1958)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. La Gard May, minister, Church of Christ, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our holy Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the refreshing opportunity of approaching Thy divine throne of grace preceding this day's deliberations by this assembly. Help us to learn that success is measured in terms of service and that sacrifices are steppingstones of service.

Lead us into an ever-increasing understanding and appreciation of the beauty of truth; and may the leaders of our beloved Nation guide us safely, peaceably, and honorably through the shades of the valley of difficulty and the sunshine of accomplishment. Consecrate within us the desire to utilize the many material blessings from Thee to develop moral and spiritual values.

May Thy love and Thy spirit so permeate our lives that we may be prepared by wisdom and inclined by disposition to accomplish Thy purpose in us. Grant to the Nation—its leaders and people—Thy providential care and ultimate salvation. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 24, 1958, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, June 25, 1958, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 6306. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes";

H. R. 6322. An act to provide that the dates for submission of plan for future control of the property of the Menominee Tribe shall be delayed; and

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment of the agreement between the States of Vermont and New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Sen-

ator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be granted leave of absence from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of this week, in order that he may attend the Indiana State convention of his party.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Special Subcommittee on S. 3888 of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the meeting of the Senate tomorrow morning the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Theodore S. Pattison, Jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the United States Coast Guard; and

William H. Blaylock, Jr., and sundry other persons, to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Col. John H. Harnett, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for partial restoration of the balances withdrawn from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, general administration," in that Department, as of May 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REVISION OF ALASKA GAME LAW

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the Alaska game law and to provide for the protection of marine mammals on and off the coast of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:
A letter in the nature of a petition from Clarence Van Vredenburg, of St. Augustine,

Fla., relating to assistance to scientists by qualified members of the public; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition signed by Mrs. Anne Flocke, and sundry other citizens of the State of California, relating to the keeping of the tariff-making power in the Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of Racine, Wis., relating to the independence of Lithuania and other enslaved nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Ivan Y. Nickerson, and sundry other members of the American Institute of Decorators, remonstrating against any change in the east front of the Capitol Building in the city of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Department of Alaska, the American Legion, at Seward, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the United States National Student Association, Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Ray Farabee, president, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3608. A bill to revive and reenact the act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (Rept. No. 1751); and

S. Res. 293. Resolution requesting that the Secretary of State bring to the attention of the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada the deep interest of the Senate in the completion of the loop road linking the Glacier National Park in the United States and the Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada (Rept. No. 1750).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 3437. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between International Falls, Minn., and Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada (Rept. No. 1752).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution extending for 60 days the special milk program (Rept. No. 1753).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2117. A bill directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 1756);

S. 3177. A bill authorizing the modification of the Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation (Rept. No. 1754);

S. 3975. A bill to provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for use of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1755);

H. R. 11861. An act authorizing the city of Chester, Ill., to construct new approaches to and to reconstruct, repair, or improve the existing approaches to a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill. (Rept. No. 1758); and

H. R. 11936. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost,

including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Brownville, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1757).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3919. A bill to amend section 1105 (b) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to implement the pledge of faith clause (Rept. No. 1759).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 4049. A bill for the relief of Fred Foster and George Morris, doing business as Independent Cab Co.; and for the relief of Pulaski Cab Co. Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 4050. A bill for the relief of Robert Y. Fluno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 4051. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 4052. A bill to amend section 303 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 4053. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 4054. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 4055. A bill to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to authorize the making of surveys of the human and natural resources of the Papago Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROGRAM OF SURVIVAL DEPOTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in recent years much attention has been given by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, State and local governments, and others to the problem of

evacuation of large numbers of civilian population from the devastated areas which would result from an attack upon this country. It is well that we have recognized this problem. I fear, however, that we have not given enough thought to the matter of survival of our people once they have been evacuated from our larger population centers or "target areas." It is this matter of survival after evacuation about which I want to talk to you today.

On behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself, I introduce a bill which would establish a program of survival depots to be strategically located in communities surrounding our "target areas." The purpose of these survival depots would be to provide emergency food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, and sanitation facilities for the people evacuated from the "target areas."

To establish and operate effectively a program of survival depots, the bill that I am introducing would set up an Emergency Survival Board composed of the Director, Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Director, Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, would serve as Chairman of the Board. The bill provides that this Emergency Board shall immediately undertake to—

First. Determine the cities within the United States which would be the most likely target areas in the event of enemy attack;

Second. Determine with respect to each selected "target area" the danger zone from which all or a major portion of the population will have to be evacuated and estimate the probable number of evacuees from each such area;

Third. Determine the areas to which evacuees will most likely be taken and estimate the number for each such area.

Within each evacuation area the Board shall establish a survival depot which shall consist of suitable warehouses, and such other facilities as the Board deems necessary for the survival of the evacuees to be served. Each survival depot shall be stocked with such food, clothing, medical supplies and shelter items as the Board determines will most adequately provide for the requirements of the evacuees. Whenever possible the Board shall acquire food and fiber items from stocks accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out price support or other agricultural programs authorized by law. Items which cannot be acquired from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks shall be purchased from such sources as the Board deems appropriate.

Items stocked at each survival depot shall be packaged and stored in a manner which will protect such items from the radioactive fallout that would be expected in the evacuation area. Items to be stocked shall include tents, cots, clothing and medical supplies from surplus cotton; flour, breads and cereals from surplus wheat; butter and powdered milk from surplus milk; peanut butter from surplus peanuts; canned

meats, fruit juices, fruits, vegetables, and other foods which have been canned, processed or otherwise prepared in suitable form for storage; and a supply of packaged rations of a type prepared for use by the Armed Forces of the United States sufficient for the initial emergency period. Arrangements shall be made to provide each survival depot with necessary sanitation facilities and an emergency water supply fit for human consumption and adequate for other needs.

In the acquisition of items to be stocked in these survival depots the Board is authorized and directed to make the fullest possible use of equipment and facilities within the evacuation area.

The stocks in storage at each survival depot shall be replenished from time to time as the Board deems advisable. In order that no stocks shall be unnecessarily destroyed or wasted by reason of storage in a survival depot for undue length of time, the Board is authorized to sell or transfer any portion of such stocks to other departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, or other agencies or organizations, for disposition under other programs and policies established by law. In this phase of the program there appears to be vast opportunities to utilize food items in connection with some of our foreign aid programs, replacing dollars which are now going abroad with food items which would otherwise be burdensome surpluses on our agricultural markets.

The benefits to be derived from this program are almost too numerous to enumerate. A few of the major benefits are:

First. A program of survival depots effectively initiated and maintained in this country would serve as a strong deterrent force against the threat of full scale nuclear attack because it is generally conceded that the nation which survives the initial attack will win in any future conflict between major world powers. The fact that we make adequate preparations for the survival of our people will lessen the danger of attack.

Second. The availability of adequate facilities and supplies of food, shelter and clothing necessary for survival would make those living in target areas feel more secure. This feeling of security could not be purchased by the individual citizen at any price.

Third. The processing of surplus agricultural commodities into items of food, clothing, shelter, and medical supplies would provide employment for many people and would serve to boost many segments of the economy.

Fourth. Vast quantities of surplus agricultural commodities would be utilized to provide the stocks needed in the survival depots; thus the current surpluses would be somewhat reduced, markets would be strengthened, and agricultural income would be increased. Since some items would be stored for a time, then disposed of through foreign aid and other programs, this would become a continuing outlet for those agricultural commodities used for food, shelter, and clothing.

Fifth. The overall cost of managing our agricultural surpluses would be reduced since these commodities, in processed form, would require less storage space and a portion thereof would replace dollars now going into foreign aid.

Sixth. The items essential for survival in time of emergency, strategically located in survival depots throughout the country, would also be invaluable in time of local disaster caused by storm, flood, or earthquake.

The time for serious consideration of this matter so vital to the survival of our Nation in the event of enemy attack is now. The time for action is the present. Visualize, if you will, yourself as an evacuee from the Washington, D. C., area in midwinter. Surplus wheat in elevators in the Midwest would not furnish food to sustain your body, surplus cotton in a warehouse in New Orleans would not protect you from freezing temperatures. In short, the vast resources of this Nation would mean very little to you because the necessary items of food, clothing, shelter and medical supplies would not have been available in sufficient quantities to permit the survival of yourself and the thousands of others evacuated from the area. I urge that this bill be enacted at the earliest possible date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4055) to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of the development of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, and the other tremendously destructive techniques being devised at the present time, Congress, in the furtherance of the national defense, and in order to preserve the lives of large numbers of the civilian population by providing for their necessary subsistence, recognizes the necessity for the establishment of a program to provide (1) for the housing, clothing and feeding of evacuees who, in the event of an enemy attack, would be required to leave the heavily populated areas of the United States and disperse into areas which would not be equipped to take care of the needs of such large groups of individuals, and (2) for the feeding and care of all other persons within such areas, by providing for the location within such areas of survival depots.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an Emergency Survival Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of the Director, Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Director, Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, shall be the Chairman of such Board.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall—

(1) determine which cities within the United States would be the most likely to be

strategic targets in the event of enemy attack;

(2) determine with respect to each such city the danger zone from which all persons will be required to be evacuated;

(3) estimate the probable numbers of such evacuees; and

(4) determine the areas to which such evacuees would most likely be taken.

(b) In each evacuation area determined under subsection (a) (4) of this section the Board shall establish a survival depot, which shall consist of suitable warehouses, and such other facilities as the Board deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(c) Each survival depot shall be stocked with such food, clothing, and shelter items as the Board determines will most adequately provide for the requirements of the evacuees. Whenever possible, the Board shall acquire food and fiber from the stocks of food and fiber acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or by the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out a support program or any other agricultural program authorized by law. Food and fiber which are suitable for acquisition from such stocks shall be transferred to the Board upon payment by it to the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, of the cost to such Secretary of acquiring such food and fiber. If food and fiber are not available from such stocks the Board shall purchase such food and fiber from those domestic sources which it deems appropriate.

(d) The items stored in a survival depot shall be packaged and stored in a condition which will protect such items from the expected amount of radioactive fallout that would be expected in the various evacuation areas. Each such depot shall contain tents, cots, clothing and medical supplies made from surplus cotton, flour milled from surplus wheat, butter made from surplus milk, powdered milk made from surplus milk, peanut butter made from surplus peanuts, canned beef, canned pork, and other canned meats, fruit juices, fruits, vegetables, and other foods which have been canned, processed, or otherwise prepared in a suitable form for storage, and a supply of rations of a type prepared for use by the Armed Forces of the United States sufficient for the initial emergency period.

SEC. 4. The Board shall provide, by contract or other arrangements with individuals and organizations for the baking, cooking, canning, or other processing necessary to convert food and fiber acquired by the Board into forms suitable for human consumption and use. Wherever possible the fullest utilization of equipment and facilities within the evacuation area shall be utilized for the processing of foods and the manufacture of fiber products.

SEC. 5. The Board is authorized and directed to make such arrangements as may be necessary to provide each evacuation area with emergency sanitation facilities and with an emergency water supply capable of providing water for human consumption and for other necessary purposes.

SEC. 6. In carrying out this act the Board shall cooperate with the American Red Cross, State and local governments, and with all other persons who would be of assistance in establishing the program authorized by this act.

SEC. 7. (a) The stock authorized to be established in such survival depots, shall be replenished from time to time as the Board deems advisable.

(b) In order that no stocks shall be unnecessarily destroyed or wasted by reason of storage in a survival depot for undue periods of time, the Board is authorized to sell or transfer to other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, or other agencies or organizations, at such times and under such terms

and conditions as it deems necessary, for disposition under other programs and policies established by law, such items stored in a survival depot, as the Board deems necessary to prevent such destruction or waste.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, RELATING TO PRACTICES IN MARKETING OF LIVESTOCK—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3538) to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN MINERALS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3816) providing for payments as incentives for the production of certain minerals, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MISBRANDING AND FALSE ADVERTISING OF FIBER CONTENT OF TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed, under the rule, amendments to the bill (H. R. 7963) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953. My amendments deal with research and development plans for small business, and the amendments are sponsored by the distinguished occupant of the Chair at the present time, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], as well as those who sponsored the original bill with me, Senators BEALL, COOPER, HUMPHREY, LONG, SPARKMAN, THYE, and HOBLITZELL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THURMOND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him,

to the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO MANAGE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I observe that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is in the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 4044) to establish a board of directors to manage the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes, introduced by him on yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, AND SO FORTH, PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him before the American GI Forum, at Toledo, Ohio, on June 21, 1958.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Commencement address delivered by him at the University of Baltimore on June 12, 1958.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 2, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424 Senate Office Building, upon the following:

Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States District Judge of the District of Kansas, vice Arthur J. Mellott, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

OPPOSITION OF WEST VIRGINIA TO EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, now that the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has passed the House in a most benevolent form so far as other nations are concerned, we who represent States with economies impaired by excessive imports must salvage what we can before sending the measure on to completion of its legislative cycle. I was

pleased that the entire West Virginia House delegation associated itself in bipartisan battle in behalf of provisions that would have enabled our working people to get back the jobs that have been eliminated from the American economy by commodities produced in lands where wages are ridiculously low and standards of living are far below those normally enjoyed in this country.

Coal, glass, textiles, and pottery are among West Virginia industries sustaining grave economic damage under current foreign-trade policies. Needless to say, the railroads of our State feel a consequent impact, for each of the millions of tons of coal displaced in east coast fuel markets by foreign residual oil would have moved by rail at least a substantial part of the journey. Thus the mining communities and the railroad centers in both northern and southern West Virginia are losing tremendous amounts of basic business volume that otherwise would redound to the benefit of the entire local populace.

I wish to thank the Members of the Senate with whom I have talked with respect to my position on the trade-agreements bill. I recognize that some of my friends are committed to support of the measure without revision. I do not presume to anticipate that every Senator who is sympathetic to the cause of West Virginia industry and labor will vote for adoption of all the amendments essential to our protection. I can only say that I am confident that we shall receive a fair hearing from each of the Members of this legislative body.

As for the national security amendment, which I trust will contain a mandatory restriction on the imports of petroleum and petroleum products, I am satisfied that no one will be intimidated by the threats of Caracas mobs. They do not represent the typical Venezuelan citizen. Although a few communities in that country are without question enjoying a level of prosperity that quite likely has never before been equaled anywhere in South America, there is no evidence that the average Venezuelan family participates in the luxury that has come with the oil boom.

But, Mr. President, we will not be influenced by the distorted statistical dosages that are sprayed over every conceivable channel of communication by the international profiteers who seek to benumb opponents of the policy which gives them open sesame to markets which otherwise would be providing a means of livelihood for thousands upon thousands of workers in West Virginia and in other coal-producing States. I call attention to figures released late last month by the Department of Public Assistance, in Charleston—data meriting the close scrutiny of every Member of Congress and every other Federal official in a position to choose between "big oil" and just plain American workers and their families. The report from Charleston discloses that the number of needy persons estimated to be receiving surplus food commodities during the month of June is approximately one-eighth of the State's population.

I also call attention to the fact that Governor Cecil Underwood on Monday of this week convened a special session of the West Virginia legislature in order to expedite clearance of matters necessary for West Virginia's participation in the Federal program to extend benefits for the unemployed.

West Virginia needs an economic stimulant. Restricting the inflow of foreign residual oil would restore to thousands of our miners and railroaders, particularly, the opportunity to return to the jobs of which they have been deprived by irresponsible foreign-trade policies. Further amendments to the reciprocal-trade program are necessary for the protection of thousands of other employees in a variety of manufacturing and processing industries that contribute to West Virginia's economic vitality.

In the coming days, I shall continue to bring our story to the attention of individual Members of the Senate. They may have other considerations that will preclude their subscribing to this crusade, but I assure them that they cannot help but recognize the justification of our appeal for a legislative safeguard against imports that are a serious impediment to the economic progress of American industries and American communities.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10378. An act to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13066. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 10378. An act to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 13066. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate has now resumed consideration of the unfinished business; therefore, it is

not necessary for me to request unanimous consent to speak for more than 3 minutes, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak for 3 minutes in the morning hour.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate—because I believe it to be very pertinent—a letter I received this morning from an editor in Alaska. In the letter he states that, in his considered opinion, Alaska cannot at this time afford the luxury of statehood.

His letter reads as follows:

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, June 23, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR: Most of the people of southeastern Alaska do not favor statehood at this time.

We who are opposed to statehood do not have the financial means to be heard, though the statehood proponents are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of our Territorial tax moneys to advocate statehood.

Briefly, we believe statehood should be delayed because:

1. We want to develop industrially first. The increased costs of statehood now would make further development impossible.

2. Costs of living and doing business in Alaska now are from 22 percent (at Ketchikan) to 55 percent (at Fairbanks) higher than in Seattle. This is because of the seasonal nature of our industries and the fact that lavish Federal expenditures have increased labor costs so high that private business cannot afford to hire people in competition with the military.

3. The Federal Government now is the source of 65 percent of the Territory's income. If military activities are discontinued in Alaska or decreased, Alaska will be in a sad state indeed as a State.

4. We have only one year-round industry; that provided by the one Ketchikan pulp mill. The rest are seasonal industries, operating only a few months each year.

5. Many Alaskans want two Senators in Congress because they believe the power wielded by these voting would result in more Federal moneys being spent in Alaska.

6. We want more population to help us support a State. We now have only 27,000 people in private industry and of these more than 6,500 are in seasonal construction, most of which is for the military. The peak employment in private industry is about 40,000 a year; the low somewhat less than 20,000 in winter.

7. It is not correct to say that statehood will attract more population. Population is controlled by economic factors. Every fall about 20,000 of our workers leave Alaska for the south due to lack of something for them to do.

8. No impartial study has been made to determine whether Alaska can support statehood.

Yours very sincerely,

EMERY F. TOBIN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD a letter to an editor by Mr. Tobin, which was reprinted in Alaska, explaining more in detail why Alaska could not at this time afford the luxury of statehood.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN ALASKA AFFORD STATEHOOD NOW?—A LETTER TO AN EDITOR FROM AN EDITOR

(By Emery F. Tobin, editor, the Alaska Sportsman)

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, March 23, 1956.

EDITOR, DAILY NEWS:

In connection with some studies I have been making on the Alaska constitution and statehood for Alaska, I have gathered certain facts and figures, some of which I gave in a talk at the meeting of the Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce yesterday and at a meeting of the Business and Professional Women's Club a few weeks ago.

In reporting my appearance at the chamber of commerce in the Daily News yesterday, several serious misstatements were made. In view of these misquotations and the several requests I have had for copies of the figures I quoted, perhaps your readers may be interested in the following review of my talk on the costs of statehood:

In general, the proposed Alaska constitution is a good one, and except for some features which have been subject to criticism, is very democratic, and provides for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

However, when a householder or a business organization wants to acquire something, the first factor usually considered is the cost, and next is whether it can be afforded. In considering statehood for Alaska, the last thing that seemed to be discussed is the cost.

HAVE PUBLIC MONEY

The advocates of "statehood now" have been granted over \$150,000 of public money by the Territorial legislature to promote statehood. This is money from the pockets of those Alaskans who do not believe Alaska is ready for statehood, as well as from those who do. The opponents have to use their own time and money for research to oppose the propaganda of the statehood adherents using public money. It is rather a losing proposition.

The supposition that Alaska is economically sound and can afford immediate statehood is based on the fact that most of the money earned in Alaska often comes easily, in a few months of the year, or from Uncle Sam. But if Alaska were as prosperous industrially as some would make it out to be, there would be no necessity for more than 20,000 people to leave Alaska every fall for lack of work. They come back in the spring, but they do not make permanent residence.

That is why Alaska, with its 586,400 square miles, does not have a population of more than 208,000. And most people do not realize that of the 208,000, some 80,000 are military men in the pay of the Federal Government, and their dependents. In addition, there are another 15,000 Government civil service employees, plus their dependents.

Of the total, also, about 35,000 people in Alaska are Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos and 30,000 are schoolchildren. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, there was an average of 26,500 persons in private industry, and even of these 6,715 were employed in contract construction, most of which was Government. Mining employed an average of 1,333; manufacturing, 4,476; transportation and utilities, 3,956; wholesale and retail business, 5,894; service industries, 2,732; and others, 1,395. These are averages for the year. The peak employment was about 40,000 in private industry in the summer; the low, somewhat less than 20,000 in winter.

COSTS \$28 MILLION

The workers and industries of Alaska may be called upon to pay as much as \$28 million a year to cover the costs of State government in addition to the other taxes they pay. That's more than \$1,000 a year each for the average number of wage earners in private industry.

Right now, Alaskans are paying into Uncle Sam's treasury nearly \$100 million a year in taxes. Income taxes amount to about \$75 million. The rest are revenues from excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, luxury items, transportation, gasoline and so forth. We'll continue to pay that load as a State. In addition, we are currently paying more than \$14 million a year into the Territorial treasury. Then we pay city taxes.

It has been estimated that the additional costs of statehood may be as much as \$14 million a year. Total, with what we are now paying for Territorial government, \$28 million.

These additional costs are for fish and wildlife administration, \$2,500,000. Operation of courts, nearly \$1 million. Support of the schools now operated by the Alaska Native Service, \$2 million. Borough government, \$150,000. Additional police system, \$300,000. Care and custody of insane, \$500,000. Roads, \$7 million. Operation of governor's office, legislative expenses and state buildings, \$600,000. These are estimated costs. Other figures run between \$10 million and the above \$14 million.

UNCLE MAKES NO PROFIT

Uncle Sam spends in Alaska for nonmilitary items, every dollar that he gets from Alaska in income and excise taxes, nearly \$100 million a year. The President's budget for the coming fiscal year is almost \$100 million. But on the whole the States are pouring into Alaska about \$300 million more than they're taking out and this money is all reflected in Alaska's present economy.

Alaska's biggest industry—and it is booming—is military defense. We don't know just what the Federal Government is spending on defense in Alaska, but it has more than 50,000 men stationed here. It costs "Uncle" at least \$400 a month a man. That's \$240 million a year. Then he's spending from \$50 million to \$100 million a year on Army, Navy, and Air Force construction work. That's a total of more than \$300 million a year for construction and men.

In addition to the money that comes to Alaska as a result of military activities, the only other steady wealth-producing revenues result from the work of one pulp mill and some lumber mills and logging operating all or most of the year. The rest are seasonal industries, working for only a few months, consisting of the fisheries, some trapping, the tourist business, and mining, which also create income. The total of Alaska-produced resources in 1954 was about \$120 million. The other activities are service businesses, dependent on military spending and the other activities without which they could not exist.

NATIVE COSTS HIGH

The Federal Government pours in millions of dollars for promotion of the health, welfare, education, and relief of Alaska's large proportion of natives—35,000. In education it even goes to the extent of providing boarding schools, such as Wrangell Institute and Mount Edgecumbe, where everything, food and housing, but excepting transportation, is furnished.

An estimated 65 to 70 percent of Alaska's gross business depends for its existence on Federal money. Washington officials realize that Alaska's economy, tied up as it is with Federal spending, is unable to support a State government at this time without extraordinary Federal help. Various bills in Congress would ease the load by millions of

dollars—some estimate by as much as \$9 million a year—if Alaska takes on the responsibilities of statehood now.

Nearly all Alaskans are in favor of eventual statehood. Those who demand it now point to the financial help the Federal Government is proposing to give and say that the additional cost to Alaska taxpayers will be much less than the figures presented above indicate. They also claim that statehood will increase population.

Some of the strongest advocates of statehood now find it difficult if not impossible to meet the present burden of taxation. The additional load of taxes imposed by the last Territorial legislature was the deciding factor in causing the Alaska Sportsman to have its printing done in the States instead of Ketchikan.

Year-around businesses such as ours are penalized not only by the employment security tax, but by the gross business tax, the increase in the Territorial income tax by 25 percent last year, the school tax by 50 percent, the imposition of an employment security tax of one-half of 1 percent on employees, and the raising of the minimum wage to the highest in the country—\$1.25 an hour.

Before the employment-security credit rating was eliminated, we were on the same basis as most States in that respect. Now we, along with the pulp mill, the lumber mills, and other year-around industries are penalized. We cannot compete on the same basis as companies in the States, and it is less costly for us to have our printing done in Illinois than in Alaska.

The shrimp industry of Petersburg found that it could not pay some of its employees the minimum wage and compete with the shrimp industry of California and Mexico. Unions and workers appealed for relief from the commissioner of labor.

CAN'T FINANCE UNEMPLOYMENT

And Alaska is the only State or Territory which has been unable to finance its employment-security payments and has had to get a loan from the Federal Government of \$3 million. It isn't just the taxes that the one business has to pay, it's the additional that the firm doing business has to pay for its supplies and the additional wages it has to pay in Alaska because of the cumulative taxes everyone has to pay to do business here. Everyone has to figure "taxes on taxes" to exist. Costs of living in Alaska today are more than 25 percent higher than in any State or other Territory.

It seems certain that population increase will take place when there is industry to support it and not before.

The only additional industries we can hope to get are those which will come here to take advantage of resources which we have but which are in dwindling supply in the States, such as timber, minerals, and fish.

Higher taxes stifle initiative and discourage investment in new enterprises. If new businesses cannot compete here on the same basis as in the States they will not come. And if the Federal Government should reduce its military establishments, or discontinue military construction, what would happen to Alaska's economy? Can Alaska afford statehood now?

Yours very truly,

EMERY F. TOBIN.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield, if I have time.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator realizes that if the present proposal is adopted, and Alaska is admitted as a State, next will be Hawaii, next will be Guam, next will be Puerto Rico, and then the Virgin Islands. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Senator from Virginia said yesterday that we had been given notice by the minority leader that he is going to bring up the bill providing for Hawaiian statehood. The Senator said all four of the Territories or possessions were in the platforms of both parties. I assume that whoever put that in the platforms expected us to forget about it later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since the Senator from Virginia has mentioned my name, will he yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California, the minority leader, did not speak about all four of them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have taken the position that both Alaska and Hawaii, as organized Territories, under the precedents we have followed in this country, should be admitted. The idea of organizing a Territory was to prepare it for statehood. I do not favor statehood for Puerto Rico. I do not favor statehood for Guam. I do not know of anyone on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle who believes action on the pending proposal will be a precedent. I do not believe the other areas mentioned should be given organized Territorial status. I do not believe the hope or promise should be held out to them for statehood. But the fact remains that the party of the Senator from Virginia and the party of the minority leader have pledged themselves to statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. I shall try to fulfill the pledge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that Puerto Rico and Guam were included in the resolutions of the political parties?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe they were included in the same category as Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Anyway, the Senator from Virginia is trying to make the point that once the precedent is set for admitting noncontiguous territory as a new State—as would be true in the case of Alaska, for instance—we would find it very difficult to resist a proposal made by the distinguished Senator from California to admit Hawaii. The Senator from Virginia stated that, outside of the fear of communistic domination, a much better case could be made for statehood for Hawaii than for Alaska. Hawaii has a population three times as great as that of Alaska. Hawaii is self-supporting. Hawaii has a wonderful climate. It is a place where people would love to live. It is a beautiful Territory. It would add to the attraction of this Union. But it is 3,000 miles from Washington to where the Senator from California lives, and it is 1,500 miles more to where his new State would be. A friend of mine from Sweden said to me, "We are 1,000 miles closer. Why don't you take us in?"

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The minority leader makes no apologies for supporting statehood for Hawaii. I quite agree with the Senator from Virginia that it is certainly equal in its claim for statehood to Alaska. But I am not going to quibble

on that point. Both of these great Territories are entitled to statehood. The people of Hawaii, by virtue of their population, by virtue of their economic activity, by virtue of the contributions they have made to the Federal Treasury—the people of Hawaii pay more taxes than do the people of some 6 or 8 of our States at the present time—are amply qualified for statehood.

During World War I and World War II, the people of Hawaii, as in the case of the people of Alaska, furnished troops for the United States who fought overseas. Their patriotism cannot be questioned, in my judgment. I think both Territories will become great States of the American Union.

The arguments made about the distance involved are the same arguments which were made against the admission of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California into the Union. I can get a plane out of Washington at midnight and have breakfast in Los Angeles or in San Francisco. It is far easier to get to Hawaii or Alaska today than it was to get to some of the neighboring States and some of the first States that were admitted into the Union after the Original Thirteen States of the Union were expanded. I do not believe the question of distance appeals to the American people as a bar to admission.

In the day and age in which we live, with instant communication by radio and telephone, and rapid transportation by airplane, the people who have been promised statehood should have the pledge fulfilled.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want my colleagues to notice that our distinguished minority leader has said he can show there is a better case for statehood for Hawaii than there is for Alaska. I think he can. I also want my colleagues to bear in mind that if statehood for Alaska is granted, they may as well become prepared for the better case which will be presented for Hawaiian statehood, which request will follow as inevitably as night follows day, or vice versa. The Senator from California has said he is going to make a better case for Hawaiian statehood than has been made so far for Alaskan statehood.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall if my good friend from Vermont, who has shown great patience, will bear with me, I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Virginia did not answer my question. Does the Senator from Virginia not believe that, regardless of the personal views of the minority leader, all the areas which have been mentioned will be admitted as States once the Alaskan precedent has been set?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what the Senator from Virginia has predicted. Hawaii will be first; then Puerto Rico; then Guam. The Communists will say we are guilty of very bad colonialism if we do not admit Guam as a State. The Senator from Mississippi is right; we shall have set the precedent for the admission into the Union of those areas.

Mr. EASTLAND. Once those areas are admitted into the Union as States, will it not result in the packing of the Senate of the United States, and the change in our form of government?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has said that the change of control is no idle threat. Certainly it will change our form of government if 6, 8, or 10 Senators are to come from areas not contiguous to the United States, and if they are to be given full votes such as Senators have from States like New York, California, and Texas.

I apologize to my friend from Vermont. He has been very kind.

Mr. EASTLAND. The minority leader did most of the talking.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia mentioned the name of the Senator from California. The minority leader made a very real contribution to the consideration of what is really before the Senate. Again I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. AIKEN. I was very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that what we have before us for consideration is a measure which has to do with admitting the incorporated Territory of Alaska into the American Union as a State. I hope we will keep away from such side issues as Guam and Puerto Rico, because those are not under consideration. Guam and Puerto Rico are not going to be under consideration. We should stick to the subject before us at the present time.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1710, Senate bill 3141.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3141) to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3141) to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to allow the Government to acquire property in square 170 of the District of Columbia. The property would be used in connection with the Government's long-range building program.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement in the report covering the

purpose of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement from the report (No. 1670) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Government to acquire property in square 170 of the District of Columbia. This property would be used in connection with the Government's long-range building program.

Square 170 lies between 17th Street and 18th Street and between New York Avenue and F Street NW. It is one block west of the White House Grounds. This area has been zoned first commercial.

The Administrator of General Services informed the committee in executive session that the Government desires to acquire this property at this time, since it appears that, in its present stage, it will be less costly. The Administrator is apprehensive that new development may take place soon in that area and that this improvement will increase the acquisition cost of the property.

The Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital and a nurses' home located in this area have been conveyed to the Government under provisions of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896, ch. 803), and the General Services Administration is now renovating these buildings for use as Government offices.

The General Services Administration estimates the cost of acquiring the property will be approximately \$2 million, the estimated fair market value of all the property which the bill would authorize the Government to acquire.

DESCRIPTION AND APPRAISAL OF PROPERTY

In square 170, 13 lots are currently without buildings and are used as parking lots. There is one vacant 3-story house, approximately 100 years old, in fair condition.

Two office buildings occupy lots 28 and 827. The first is a 6-story 50-year-old building, in good condition. The second is a 4-story 75-year-old building, in good condition. Both buildings are now being leased to the Government.

There are two 3-story residences, in fair condition, 75 years old.

Four residences, in fair condition, ranging from 75 to 125 years old, are used as rooming houses.

There is one commercial office building, 125 years old, in good condition.

Four buildings, 75 to 125 years old, in fair condition, are used as business places, with a portion of each building being used as a rooming establishment or as residences. One of these buildings is the Allies Inn, a restaurant and rooming house.

OCTAGON HOUSE

The bill specifically excludes the Octagon House, a historic building located on the property owned by the American Institute of Architects. The remaining buildings on this property are modernized office space utilized by the American Institute of Architects. All these buildings and improvements are exempted by specific provision of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3141) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 149, ch. 58), is amended by adding, after the word "squares," the following number and exception:

"170 (except for the real property and improvements thereon owned at present by the American Institute of Architects and located

at the southwestern corner of square 170 where New York Avenue and 18th Street NW. intersect)."

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, now that consideration of the unfinished business has been resumed, it is not necessary for me to ask unanimous consent to proceed for more than 3 minutes, is it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No, the Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the matter on which I desire to speak is very close to Alaska, at any rate. I wish to speak of the relations between the United States and Canada for a few minutes.

Mr. President, I am happy to take note of the increased interest of the Congress, and by the public, as well, concerning relations between the United States and Canada.

At a time like the present, when international communism is again showing its teeth, it is well that we take stock of what is going on in the country with which we have most in common.

The Committee on Foreign Relations on May 16 devoted a full day of hearings to the subject of United States policy with respect to Canada as part of its overall review of United States foreign policy. The committee was privileged to hear and question the Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, the United States Ambassador to Canada, and Dr. Percy Corbett from the center for international studies at Princeton University. These hearings will be published soon. I commend them to Members of the Senate because many of the important aspects of current relations and problems with Canada are touched on in these hearings.

Mr. President, it will do no harm once again to remind ourselves of the importance of Canada to the United States. This phase of the matter could also be approached from the other way around, namely, the importance of the United States to Canada. I shall leave that to my Canadian friends. Needless to say, many of the matters which I shall mention from the point of view of the United States are equally worthy of mention when viewed from the other side of the border.

An announcement has recently been made of arrangements which have been completed between the United States and Canada for participation in the North American Air Defense Command, called NORAD for short. Canada is a full partner in these defense arrangements, as she should be. After all, Canada lies between us and our most potential enemy. We here in the United States cannot adequately defend ourselves without relying heavily on the

cooperation which Canada alone can offer. It is for this reason that planning and operations in air defense are now in a completely integrated United States-Canadian concern. I dare say that we have more completely merged our military arrangements in this respect with Canada than we have ever done before with any nation in peacetime.

Mr. President, all one has to do is look at the map and trace the course of the St. Lawrence Seaway as it comes down along the border between our two countries to realize what a tremendous difference this new trade artery will soon make to life and economics in both countries. As we see the beneficial effects of the seaway beginning to be felt, we should feel regret that we delayed work on it so long.

We may feel gratified, however, that the Congress has recently directed that a study be made of another important waterway from New York City to the Canadian border by way of the Hudson River and Lake Champlain. It is expected that the Canadians will soon take up planning this waterway from the border to the St. Lawrence.

When this waterway is completed, as it surely will be, the distance by water from the heartland of Canada and the United States to points on our Atlantic coast will be lessened by over 1,200 miles.

I doubt whether there is any nation to which we owe more for its helpful cooperation in international organizations than Canada. Canada is a member of the United Nations and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, two international organizations in which we have invested so much both of our substance and of our hopes. Canada has been a constant, helpful participant with us in these undertakings. In addition, Canada plays an important role of her own in several international organizations of which we are not members but from whose work we benefit. I have in mind the British Commonwealth of Nations, the International Control Commission in Indochina, and the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

Canada is the best customer for our exports of all the countries in the world. One-fifth of the United States total foreign trade in 1957 was with Canada. The United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon Canada for newsprint, woodpulp, aluminum, fish, and iron ore. We are also increasingly dependent upon Canada as a market for automobiles, machinery, chemicals, petroleum products, foodstuffs, and manufactured goods.

Americans have invested about \$13 billion in Canada; \$8 billion of this investment is in business, and the rest constitutes investments in Government and municipal bonds of Canada. These bare facts indicate the tremendous economic importance of Canada to the United States. Important as Canada is to us, we must never forget that United States trade is even more important to Canada. Two-thirds of Canada's entire foreign trade is with the United States. What may seem to us to be a small change in our economic policy may have a very big impact north of the border.

In any catalog of the benefits which we obtain from having Canada as a

neighbor, we should, of course, mention the fact that Canada is and always has been a peaceful country. The 3,000 miles of unfortified boundary between us testifies to that. It is a free country. It is a democracy as fully responsive to the needs and desires of its people as our own. Canada is a booming country, not only in agriculture and industry, but in cultural affairs and in her intellectual life.

Canadians and United States citizens visit freely in each other's countries. A recent poll indicates that while only 27 percent of all Canadians of voting age have visited another Canadian province, more than 60 percent of them have visited in the United States.

Mr. President, in view of all these reasons for taking extra care of our relations with Canada, it is somewhat discomforting to acknowledge that there are a number of problems which tend to be irritating. It is well to review these matters from time to time. I have no intention of trying to suggest solutions today, but I hope it will be helpful, nevertheless, merely to mention the problems which face us.

Mr. President, two of the main problems which we have with Canada were mentioned recently in a speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada, the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, delivered at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn. I ask unanimous consent that Prime Minister Diefenbaker's speech be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as Dr. Corbett said in addressing the Committee on Foreign Relations the other day, the problems which we have with Canada can be divided into those which we cannot help and those which we can do something about. We cannot help our differing histories, our respective geographies, the disparity of population and power and many other immutable factors. The very fact that rivers and streams cross and recross our border gives us trouble. The fact that the United States now has world responsibilities which cause us to take actions from time to time which impinge on Canada is something which we cannot avoid. The fact that private investors here and buyers in Canada have economic preferences which result in a certain trade pattern and balance is something that cannot be affected without a kind of government interference which may be unwise. Also, the fact that there is now in Canada a growing nationalism is one of those consequences of historical events which we must take account of but which cannot be affected very much.

There are some differences, however, Mr. President, between Canada and ourselves which can be resolved either by action by one or the other of the two countries or by measures taken in common. Let me begin with two problems referred to by Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I quote from his address which I mentioned a moment ago.

We have difficulties arising from our trade relations and in particular from the fact that while there has been a continuing unfavorable balance of trade for Canada over the years, in the last 2 or 3 years we have been purchasing from the United States more than a billion dollars a year more than the United States has purchased from us, and that in the disposal program of agricultural products by the United States, Canada has been materially hurt economically.

The imbalance in United States-Canadian trade is something which is taken very seriously by the Canadians. The imbalance is compensated for in large part by a flow of dollars from the United States to Canada in the form of industrial investment. This investment in Canada in turn brings with it another problem. Canadians naturally worry a great deal when they see the large degree of control by United States owners over Canadian natural resources and industry, and they object whenever restrictions are placed in the way of participation by Canadians in the ownership and management of companies in Canada which are subsidiaries of United States companies, this notwithstanding the fact that Canadians themselves are large investors in the parent United States companies as well as other United States securities.

It seems quite clear that the answers to these economic issues will depend very largely on the tariff and trade policies pursued by the two Governments. If the United States maintains a high tariff on goods which would naturally move to the United States, we shall hurt Canadian producers and hurt American consumers who would otherwise benefit. If, on the other hand, the Government of Canada distorts the natural flow of goods and services from the United States to Canada by measures such as "buy Canadian," or "buy Commonwealth" restrictions, such actions can only hurt Canadian consumers and United States exporters, and to some extent Canadian investors in United States stocks.

I now turn to the assertion by Prime Minister Diefenbaker that the policies of the United States in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities have hurt Canada. In the view of Canadians, through United States sales and barter activities under Public Law 480, we are subsidizing the disposal of surplus grain, using resources from other portions of the economy to pay our losses, with the result that Canada's opportunity to export wheat is lessened.

The fact is that both Canada and the United States have surpluses of wheat. Both of us have the opportunity to dispose of these surpluses in ways which may benefit hungry people as well as to take measures to prevent or reduce such surpluses. There is no question that there is an element of subsidy in the method by which we attempt to reduce our surpluses through the Public Law 480 programs. If there were no subsidy, United States wheat would be only a residual supply for the world market.

Public Law 480 has built into it adequate safeguards; but, in the application of the principles embodied in the act, we have in the past made mistakes. Sometimes our policies and programs

have been beneficial to Canada, as in those instances in which we have been able to increase demand in foreign countries for wheat where there had been no market. I have in mind the successful efforts in some places to shift consumer preferences from rice to wheat. On the other hand, there are instances in which activities of the United States in the Public Law 480 programs have been harmful to Canada as well as to our own dollar market. With good reason, the Canadians are particularly resentful of certain barter deals which have been consummated from time to time. I believe that the barter provisions in the current extension of Public Law 480 should be restricted to instances in which neither United States nor Canadian dollar sales will be displaced. If the new law does not require this, I would hope and expect that the Department of Agriculture would use the barter authority most wisely, having in mind what I have said about the importance of continuing to have beneficial relations with Canada.

Another problem with Canada, which Prime Minister Diefenbaker was kind enough not to mention in his speech, is the matter of oil imports from Canada into the United States.

The development of petroleum resources in Canada has proceeded in substantial measure through capital investment from the United States. There has been a phenomenal growth of oil production in Canada, although the Canadian production represents something less than 3 percent of world production at present. Canadian confidence and expectations received a severe blow last December when it was announced that Canadian oil shipments to the west coast and to the northern part of the United States were to be subject to the voluntary oil import program. Canadians felt that they had been misled to some extent and they were particularly irritated by the argument that the import control program was justified on the ground that in the event of a war emergency there would be need for adequate supplies in the United States.

This argument simply does not make sense as applied to Canadian oil production because in the event of war Canadian reserves and production will be fully as available to the United States as our own petroleum resources. In fact, it was the dire need of the United States for oil in World War II that prompted a speed-up in Canadian explorations.

Mr. President, it is not appropriate for me to try to discuss here the solutions to these economic problems in detail. They are very complex indeed. Presumably, the executive branch experts are working on them full time. I hope that, as the Committee on Foreign Relations considers the next steps in its review of foreign policy, consideration will be given to a detailed study of these economic problems with Canada.

The final item on the list of Canadian grievances to which I will refer is the complaint which is perhaps the most disturbing and which in some ways is the hardest of all to deal with. I refer to reports of growing Canadian irritation resulting from their view that Americans

are patronizing in their attitude toward Canadians. I do not agree that Americans have been patronizing toward their Canadian neighbors. I do admit that we have regarded Canada as a member of the family, and consequently we have tended to put off moving toward solutions of problems which we have known about for quite a while by saying to ourselves that, of course, we shall solve these problems, because there can be no question of real difficulty with our friends the Canadians.

Mr. President, the Canadians have some right to be irritated with us. Too many Americans are uninformed on the subject of Canada. Canadians, on the other hand, have access to information about nearly everything that is going on in the United States. This is a problem which cannot be solved in a short time. It is a matter of education with us. It is a matter of continuing self-evaluation. One reason I am making this statement today is that I am trying to make our people more aware of the common needs and aspirations of the United States and Canada.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker refers to this problem of attention to Canada in the following way:

The relations between our countries cannot be taken for granted. They require constructive, continuing, and cooperative consideration. We will let you know when we have grievances, as you will let us know. Good relations are reciprocal. I want to reiterate that our attitude is not one of anti-Americanism but rather of pro-Canadianism.

I wish also to quote from a recent address by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, at the Vassar College commencement in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., on June 9, 1950. Mr. Pearson puts the matter this way:

I am also a citizen of a vigorous and free country, your neighbor and friend. A country which has experienced, in these years, a period of great growth and development, with some of the inevitable accompanying pains. A country with a surging feeling of national pride that makes us in Canada somewhat sensitive about slights; and annoyed when action is taken by our neighbor which hurts us, especially in the field of trade and economics in which our destiny is linked as closely with yours as it is in the field of survival. In trade, don't fence us out, and in politics don't take us benevolently for granted. We are, in fact, a little touchy—perhaps occasionally too touchy—about being overlooked, both in respect of our problems and our achievements.

Mr. President, what can we do about these social and educational problems which these two leaders in Canada have referred to?

Certainly, if United States citizens were aware of the need for Canada and the United States to work together to the fullest degree and of the stirring developments taking place north of the border, the situation would be greatly improved.

Yet, very little Canadian news is carried by the American press more than a hundred miles south of our northern boundary.

I am told that only two American newspapers have regular correspondents in Canada, whereas all that goes on in

our country is promptly reported all over Canada.

The United States press may say there is little demand for Canadian news among their readers and possibly be right about it.

It is probable that a good many Members of the Congress are poorly informed as to what is going on in the great nation to the north.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, that if our two countries had reciprocal subcommittees of Congress and the Canadian Parliament that could meet and discuss matters of common interest, we would not only have a better understanding of legislative matters but could better convey the substance of that understanding to the American people.

In considering supplies of wheat, oil, lead, zinc, and other commodities we would do well to consider such supplies as a single stockpile.

Not that these national supplies can be physically merged, or that they will cease to be competitive, but in the field of world development and world trade and North American security, they are so vitally important that a cooperative understanding relating to production, stockpiling, and disposal becomes a mutual necessity.

Mr. President, I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Senate certain suggestions for improvement in United States-Canadian relations which were put forward by Prime Minister Diefenbaker in the speech to which I have already referred.

First, The Prime Minister states an important principle which we can endorse at once; namely, that the United States and Canada will in the future need to refrain from steps which will weaken each other in our common quest for the survival of freedom.

Second, Prime Minister Diefenbaker suggests joint action to meet the current problem of unemployment. I would certainly hope that this Canadian suggestion would meet with a ready response in the administration.

Third, Mr. Diefenbaker refers specifically to the idea that the Congress and the Parliament of Canada can do more by way of exchanging ideas and visits, with which I have just expressed agreement.

Fourth, The Prime Minister brings up again the idea of NATO food bank, as he calls it, which would help remove overhanging surpluses of wheat and other storable farm products and at the same time help to assure that food reserves will be available in Europe in the event of war.

The idea of a food bank is not new. It has several times been brought up in the United Nations and rejected because of physical difficulties involved on a world scale.

Whether it is possible to work out a plan for maintaining adequate reserves of food for the NATO nations on a fair and effective basis is an unanswered question.

The burden or responsibility should not rest on Canada and the United States alone.

The idea costs money to implement, and the danger somehow does not seem urgent enough to those who would be expected to share the cost.

Mr. President, let me refer briefly to three other items to which I think extra attention is deserved.

First, the question of aluminum production and distribution. We were very much worried during the Korean war that aluminum shortages could not be quickly overcome. The vast expansion of production facilities in this country and Canada have now to some extent temporarily outrun the need. This would not be so bad, because it is almost certainly temporary, but we are now faced with a drive from the Soviet Union to take over the foreign market for aluminum. Surely this is a matter which United States and Canadian interests could consider for the common good.

Second, Mr. President, it is essential that consideration of Canada and our common problems should be prominently in mind when the Senate considers the Reciprocal Trade Act extension. In view of the importance of Canada to this country, it appears that a special and forceful argument can be made that the Reciprocal Trade Act should be extended of the benefits we get from trade with Canada, because of Canada's very great dependence upon her exports, and because, as I pointed out earlier, two-thirds of Canada's export trade is with the United States. I have already referred to the existing lack of balance in trade between Canada and the United States. A defeat of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act would gravely aggravate the existing problem.

And, third, I would recommend that any Inter-American Economic Conference which may be held in the future should by all means include Canada among its participants. The aim of such a conference would be to find ways to avoid extreme commodity price fluctuations, to promote economic growth and technical cooperation, and to work toward a common market and currency convertibility for the Western Hemisphere. The recent experience of Vice President Nixon in Latin America may indicate that such an economic conference is more urgent than we thought.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we must realize that Canada is taking her place among the great nations of the world. The vast resources and the relatively small population of Canada mean that she is destined to go through a period of tremendous and rapid growth.

I daresay that within the span of the next 20 years, Canada will have a population of 30 million people. The St. Lawrence Valley will become one of the world's greatest industrial areas. The mighty resources of water power, minerals, waterways, agriculture and recreational facilities will be more extensively developed even north of the Arctic Circle and the social, economic and political fortunes of our two countries will become more closely interlocked than ever. It is entirely in the interest of the United States to work as closely with Canada as we possibly can in the years ahead.

EXHIBIT 1

NOTES OF SPEECH PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, MIDDLETOWN, CONN., SUNDAY, JUNE 8, 1958, BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE JOHN G. DIEFENBAKER, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

I am honored to be admitted to the fellowship of Wesleyan College which, for more than a century and a quarter, has been in the forefront of outstanding colleges dedicated to the liberal arts, and noted for their hospitality to freedom.

I regard it as an honor given, not to me personally, but to my country which, in its relations with yours are unequaled anywhere among the nations.

This college is of that illustrious company that education defined by John Milton:

"I call, therefore, a complete and generous education [one] which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices both private and public of peace and war."

With freedom challenged today in all parts of the world, and with the emphasis that is being placed on material things of defense and survival, there has developed in the conscience of many good and responsible people, a demand that universities should endeavor to achieve a virtual monopoly of scientific training and research.

While the encouragement of science must receive emphatic support to meet not only the international emergency but for the continuing benefit of mankind, I am of those who believe that for the universities of the Free World, to forsake the encouragement of the spiritual things and enshrine the machine would be a course as dangerous as it would be shortsighted. To meet the challenge of the tyranny of communism does not mean that we must adopt the techniques of its tyranny.

To repudiate emphasis on the things which make for the freedom of the human spirit, or to subvert education to materialistic purposes would, in the longer perspective, cause the irretrievable loss of freedom.

In my college days, science promised its uses for the benefit of mankind and humanity's golden age. Communism would make its use the mortal cockpit of mankind, having adopted science as an essential means of dominating mankind.

The danger to mankind's survival was anticipated with prophetic accuracy by the Right Honorable Herbert Asquith, one of the First War Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom when, in 1920, he said:

"The experience of this war has made actual what was unimaginable before. But there are, or would be, if the old system were to continue, two new factors at work. The first and most obvious is the unexplored and still incalculable effect of the harnessing of science to the chariot of destruction. We have seen in these 4 years only a rudimentary application of methods and agencies unknown and undreamt of in the campaigns of the past. Science has in these matters not only said her last word; she is still lisping the alphabet of annihilation. If she is to be diverted for another 20 years into the further elaboration of the mechanism and chemistry of destruction, we may well pray for the speediest possible return of the glacial epoch."

What would he have said today in this era of hydrogen bombs and atomic warheads and intercontinental missiles?

Scientific miracles have wrought fantastic changes in material well-being for mankind but science dare not be allowed to become the master of freedom or freedom will perish.

Wesleyan College is of those educational institutions which maintain the primacy of the spiritual springs from which it draws its strength, and without which freedom would perish.

Believing that the honour conferred on me is designed to be an honour to my country, I intend to speak to you on the importance of Canadian-American relations to the future of the Free World, and the need of fostering and expanding the unity of our purpose in the cause of freedom.

Our two nations have a major mission for freedom; the United States, with its vast industrial power and population and by the contribution that it has made in war for freedom and in peace so unselfishly given to the welfare of all nations; and Canada with its vast mineral and other resources and by its equally proven devotion and sacrifice of 100,000 men in two world wars. We have much in common.

Our nations must stand together with other freedom-loving nations. Our two nations have an appointment with world destiny, for the shield of freedom requires not only the resolution of freemen that springs from the sharing of common spiritual values which is the heritage of all free nations but as well the material strength of material resources with which our two countries have been singularly blessed. The unity of these two countries, therefore, a unity of purpose is of importance not only to ourselves but to the nations of the Free World.

Politically, Canada and the United States, while each drawing the inspiration of their political systems from Great Britain, have grown up by separate and different ways, one achieving its freedom and independence by revolution, the other by evolution—the United States a Republic, while Canada, an equally sovereign nation, gives its allegiance to the mystic and intangible unity of the Crown in a Commonwealth of Nations joined by no agreement are maintained by no compulsion, but by the common aspirations of independent people in all parts of the globe.

They differ in form—the Constitution of the United States, and our constitution, written and unwritten, both are based on the belief that law and authority derive from moral principles by which and in no other way, can freedom and justice be achieved.

The United States owes much to the political genius of British peoples and British peoples owe much to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers of the United States. Canada is indebted to Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others of your founders for the federal system of government which we borrowed and applied to the needs of our nation, and without which, Canadian Confederation could not have been achieved.

The concept of the Commonwealth of Nations provides freedom and independence to each of its members, while giving to each the enrichment of a partnership in a family of nations global in extent. Few of our people realize that the concept upon which our Commonwealth was built was first enunciated in 1775 when the Olive Branch Petition was signed by 46 members of the Continental Congress including Elijah Dyer, Roger Sherman, and Silas O'Deane of Connecticut, as well as John Hancock, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Richard Lee, and Thomas Jefferson, and presented to King George III.

All of the principles of the Statute of Westminster which binds the Commonwealth together, were embodied in this petition delivered to the British after the battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill had been fought. Had it been accepted it would have brought about the principles upon which the Commonwealth is now built. This was not to be but the ideas of the Founders of this Nation expressed in that petition in the process of time have become the cornerstone of the Commonwealth.

As Nicholas Murray Butler said, some 25 years ago:

"It is one of the most astounding things in the history of government that these men

off in this distant series of colonies, economically in their infancy, financially helpless and dependent, had the vision of organization which has come now to all the British peoples. . . . So it is in the history of our race. Ideas, how slowly they travel; arguments, how slowly they are apprehended; action, how slowly it follows upon conviction."

As inheritors of a common faith in and devotion to the same abiding principles of liberty and peace, the relationships between us constitute a model for mankind. And so they must remain. Now, and in the future, that need has been intensified by the developments of science in intercontinental ballistic missiles and Canada's strategic position as the neighbor of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R.

It is necessary for both of our nations to carefully examine that relationship, not only for the benefit of our respective countries, but for the contribution we can make in unity for all mankind.

There is a desire among the people of your country to understand not merely Canadian problems, but to understand Canada and Canadians.

I can assure you that there is a universal desire among Canadians to increase their understanding of the United States and to the end that our unity of purpose shall remain unimpaired.

In population the United States is 10 times greater than Canada; economically the United States is about 20 times as strong. We live as it were as 2 families in the same house—1 continent—in which 1 of the occupants is a giant, and another giant just around the corner who does not share our views.

We have difficulties arising from our trade relations and in particular from the fact that while there has been a continuing unfavorable balance of trade for Canada over the years, in the last 2 or 3 years we have been purchasing from the United States more than a billion dollars a year more than the United States has purchased from us, and that in the disposal program of agricultural products by the United States, Canada has been materially hurt economically.

We are united in our defenses both in Europe and in North America. We have recently entered into the NORAD Air Defense Agreement which will come before the Canadian Parliament on Tuesday for approval which is indicative of the cooperation necessary in the interests of survival for both of us and for freedom itself.

But unity in defense is not enough. We must reinforce our defense action by economic collaboration.

The relations between our countries cannot be taken for granted. They require constructive, continuing and cooperative consideration. We will let you know when we have grievances, as you will let us know. Good relations are reciprocal. I want to reiterate that our attitude is not one of anti-Americanism but rather of pro-Canadianism. As the Canadian Minister for Foreign Affairs (Sidney Smith) said recently—"True friendship cannot be wrecked by honest frankness."

One of the most encouraging signs of a desire to bring about the dissolution of potential difficulties between our countries was that taken by the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs in issuing a special report on May 5 last on Canadian-American Relations which was prepared by Congressman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, and Frank N. Coffin, of Maine.

A major source of difficulty has been the disposal program of surplus farm products abroad which has had the effect during the last 2 or 3 years of detrimentally affecting Canada, which depends heavily on wheat exports, by way of barter deals and subsidized

tied sales which in our opinion go beyond what is fair and competitive.

The U. S. S. R. appears now to be directing its major attention to the weakening of the Free World on the economic front. I believe that the nations of the Free World will have to act cooperatively and effectively on economic matters, as they do in defense—that each of the free nations will have to refrain from action which will detrimentally weaken their partner in freedom's quest for freedom's survival anywhere in the world.

Just to mention a few of the things in respect of which an imaginative policy could be helpful. . . .

To remove overhanging surpluses of wheat and other storable farm products and at the same time to assure that strategic reserves of these commodities will be available in Europe should war come.

The setting up of a NATO food bank would have a dual purpose in this regard and could also be used as a means to assist food deficit nations when in need.

The problem of serious unemployment is another that must be met in the Free World, for should it become general it would afford communism its greatest impetus. Joint action to meet the problem would seem to be something worthy of consideration.

To meet the problem of the relations of our nations the Hays-Coffin report suggested a Congressional Committee on Canadian Relations. I am sure that the Parliament of Canada would give the fullest consideration to the setting up of a similar committee of Canadian Parliamentarians who in periodic visits to our respective capitals would do much to achieve suggested solutions of recurring problems.

The benefits that will flow from such a joint meeting were very apparent in 1942 when at a Parliamentary Conference at which I had the honor to preside, Members of the Congress of the United States met in conference for the first time with Canadian and Commonwealth Members of Parliament.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for making the speech he has made today. To the best of my knowledge, in the 16 years I have been in Congress this is the first time I have heard a major speech on American-Canadian relations. It has been long overdue. The fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has chosen to make the speech is an indication of his awareness of the difficulties as well as the comity which exists between our two great nations, and the need for laying the cards on the table.

I am happy to note that in the Chamber at this time are a great many Senators from States which border on Canada. I refer to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye], and our Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]. Of course, my State, too, borders on Canada. All of us are interested in what happens in Canada. Both the United States and Canada owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for laying before us, in a frank and understanding manner, the facts of life as they pertain to our two countries.

I hope that not only will Canada heed what he has said this morning, but that

our own people, and the administration, as well, will heed his sound advice and good counsel and wise admonition.

Again I congratulate and salute the senior Senator from Vermont for his outstanding work in this field.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Montana. He has lived, as I have, alongside of Canadians all his life. I do not believe we can overemphasize the necessity for understanding what is going on in our neighboring country to the north. That is why I have spoken as I have, because it is a matter of the most vital importance.

I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I join in the fine things which have been said by the Senator from Vermont about the very wonderful country of Canada. The ideas he has expressed should be made familiar to the people of the United States, so they will understand the problems as they really exist.

I realize that the Senator from Vermont has given much study to this question. Together with the Senator from Vermont, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as also is the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. We realize that probably the future, and indeed the very safety, of our country depend upon our ability to work in the same boat, so to speak, with our neighbor to the north. We are kinfolk in so many ways. We must not let the little differences which have arisen, particularly in relation to our large production of wheat and dairy products, create a condition of dissatisfaction between us. As I have said, the Canadians are kinfolk of ours in many ways. They have the same faith and the same enterprise; and they have a potential for growth in every way.

I was about to ask to have printed in the Record an article concerning diverse research activities at the University of Wisconsin. In my humble opinion, the problem which the Senator from Vermont presented in relation to the large production of wheat and the large production of other agricultural products can be solved by investigations and research in chemistry. For example, consider corn. A few years ago it was only hog feed. Now think of the numerous articles which are made from corn.

I am satisfied that if we and our neighbor to the north will use our brains to create further uses of our agricultural products and other raw materials, instead of using them to create weapons, we will find the answer to many of our problems.

Again, I compliment the Senator from Vermont upon a very challenging statement. I hope it will be spread broadcast by the press of this country and of Canada, so that these two great peoples themselves will understand the significant part which they should play in bringing our two nations closer together on a basis of mutual understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I join in complimenting and commending the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his statement concerning our relations with Canada and on the other matters which were brought out in his statement. The Senator from Vermont has delivered a scholarly address. It pointed out most clearly the importance of the relations between the United States and the Government of Canada. Canada has been a close neighbor of ours, not only geographically, but in its thinking and in its outlook with respect to its relations with the United States.

There has never been a time when our borders have witnessed an unpleasant incident of any kind. Ours has been a relationship which stands out most clearly as an example of how two great Nations can live, border to border, in a most pleasant, harmonious way. It has been an example for other nations of the world to heed. It has been a relationship which should demonstrate to the people of the world that two great Nations can readily coordinate their industrial, business, and social relations.

I commend the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York. New York is a great State which is developing the power of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with the neighboring Canadian province of Ontario.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Vermont in thus yielding. I commend him most highly for his remarks and desire to associate myself with them.

New York is among the States of the Union which border on Canada. We regard Canada as our greatest and dearest friend among all the nations of the world. I think the same can be said on behalf of all citizens of the United States. It simply happens that Canada is our closest neighbor. I cannot really see any difference between Canadians—especially those who live in the provinces nearest New York—and the citizens of the United States. To all intents and purposes, we are one. The boundary line is imaginary. That is all there is to it.

It simply happens that our Canadian friends do not want to belong to the United States—and I think probably there is some argument in their favor in that regard. But that does not alter the fact that Canada is a very great nation. As I said before, Canada is our closest friend among all the other nations of the world. Canada means more to us as a friend than do all the other nations of the world combined. We stand together on the North American continent one and inseparable. We are not divided in any sense of the word, when the welfare of the people of the continent is at stake.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York. It might be interesting to know that in 1957, 53,522,956 persons crossed the border between the United States and Canada, traveling from one

country to the other. That figure is so enormous that it is almost hard to realize.

The Senator from New York and I, living where we do, almost instinctively forget the boundary line and forget that Canada, technically, is a foreign country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I regret exceedingly that because I was attending a committee meeting I did not have the opportunity to hear the address of the Senator from Vermont on the subject of United States-Canadian relations. But I want to identify myself with his speech, because I know that his position and mine are the same. I also commend the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] for the fine words which he expressed concerning our relationship with Canada. Although my State does not border on Canada, we in New Jersey fully realize the importance of good relations between the United States and Canada. I am wholeheartedly in favor of what the Senators from Vermont and New York have said.

From a purely personal standpoint, throughout my life I have had the good fortune to journey to Canada practically every year. I have traveled back and forth among those fine people almost every year since I was a small boy, partly for recreation and partly for other reasons.

So I feel very deeply, as does the Senator from Vermont, that our relationship with Canada is one of the most important, if not the most important, which we have in the entire world. Especially on this continent, it is essential that we maintain our warm friendship and the world-breaking record of having a boundary as long as that between Canada and the United States with no idea and no thought of any fortification or stoppage of travel or trade between the two countries.

I commend the Senator for his excellent speech.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. On my frequent visits to Canada, I have noticed that automobiles bearing New Jersey license tags are very numerous.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is very true.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that the people of New Jersey appreciate the hospitality of the Canadians and know where to go to have a good vacation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I associate myself with what has been said about the importance of maintaining our traditional friendship with the people of Canada.

Within the past year, a very dear friend of mine has gone to Canada. He had some relatives there. Since he has been there, he has written to me 2 or 3 times about the attitude and the misinformation which has developed in certain quarters. He now operates a radio station there and expects to do what he can to improve our relationships.

I shall send him a copy of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the remarks of the able Senator from Vermont, which have been supplemented by the remarks of other Senators, as evidence of a desire on the part of the United States Senate to maintain good relations with our neighbor to the north.

DIVERSE RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning it was my pleasure to present a statement to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which is holding very important hearings on S. 3126, a bill to establish a Department of Science and Technology.

This subcommittee, under the distinguished chairmanship of my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and including such able members as our associate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], has been hearing testimony from such outstanding leaders as Dr. Alan Waterman, of the National Science Foundation, on the problem of how best to make available the prompt results of peaceful scientific research.

In my own statement, as filed with the subcommittee, I stated my agreement

with the subcommittee's theme about the importance of making the universities of this land great centers of discovery and dissemination of scientific data to a far greater extent than is already being done.

I have been pleased to point out on many occasions that the universities of this country are even more than great educational centers; they are advance outposts of discovery; they are the vantage points from which unhindered minds can venture forth in the exploration of the unknown.

Naturally, being most familiar with such discoveries by my own alma mater, the University of Wisconsin, I am pleased to cite the University at Madison as one of the great such outposts.

This morning, I received from Dean Lindley J. Stiles, of the School of Education, a most interesting summary of the research projects which have been carried on at the university during the past decade or so.

The summary was compiled with the assistance of the famous Prof. Merle Curti, whose name is so highly esteemed in higher education in our land.

Dean Stiles' list covers the broad gamut of sciences—the so-called exact sciences—and the social sciences. We see here men's searching for facts in the fields of sociology, anthropology, social work, political science, rural sociology, journalism, agricultural specialties, geography, economics, education, and psychology. We see here how a great

State university provides answers in considerable part of direct use to the people of the State, themselves, in addition to being of use elsewhere.

I send to the desk this list.

I do so because I think that those of us who are concerned with legislation should take time now and then to reacquaint ourselves with the excellent variety of work which is done in our centers of higher learning, particularly with their research projects.

These are the diverse fields into which men are venturing because they feel an inner need to contribute to man's knowledge of himself and of his environment. Researchers feel obligated to themselves, to their university, to the community of sciences, to advance men's frontiers, the intellectual frontiers of the spirit.

In my judgment, we must have far more research than we now have. American industry is spending \$7½ billion on research this year. Government has its responsibilities, not simply in military research, but in civilian research, as well.

And the universities of the United States have their responsibilities, too, and must be enabled to fulfill those responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that Dean Stiles and Professor Curti's enumeration be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examples of research in the social studies at the University of Wisconsin, 1948-58

Field	Subject	Title and/or content	Person
Sociology and Anthropology.	Wisconsin prehistory....	Archeological work in selected counties resulting in definition of new cultural complexes and clarification of relationships between groups already known (1948-58).	Baeris, David A.
Do.....	Archeology.....	Cooperation in excavation in several Arikara sites in Missouri Basin of South Dakota (1956).....	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Description of some 75 sites previously excavated in northeastern Oklahoma (currently).....	Do.
Do.....	Zoology.....	Interrelationships of biological and cultural change (currently).....	Do.
Do.....	Ethnological history.....	Contemporary Indian problems, particularly in reference to the Potawatomi (currently).....	Do.
Do.....	Sociology.....	Research results on World War II German youth in concluding chapter of Von Barette Schwankt die Feder. 1949.	Becker, Howard.
Do.....	Propaganda.....	Completion and publication of studies in black (subversive) propaganda during World War II and thereafter. 1949.	Do.
Do.....	Sociology.....	Changes in the Social Stratification of Contemporary Germany. 1950.....	Do.
Do.....	Anthropology.....	In Defense of Morgan's Grecian Gens: Ancient Kinship and Stratification. 1950-56.....	Do.
Do.....	Social history.....	Church and State in the Cosmos of Crete. 1956.....	Do.
Do.....	Social anthropology.....	For a Science of Social Man: Convergences in Anthropology, Sociology, and Psychology. Studies on interrelationships. 1954.	Do.
Do.....	Sociology.....	Field Work Among Scottish Shepherds and German Peasants: Wholes and Their Handicaps. 1956.	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change.....	Becker, Boskoff, and graduate students.
Do.....	Criminology.....	The Black Market: A Study of White Collar Crime; Vandalism as a subtype of juvenile delinquency and its relation to a peer group subculture.	Clinard, Marshall B.
Do.....	Sociology.....	The differences in role behavior of Negro students from segregated colleges attending a nonsegregated university.	Do.
Do.....	Sociology-Criminology.....	A comparative study of crime and delinquency in Sweden including a cross-cultural replication of the relation of urbanism to criminal behavior. 1954-55.	Do.
Do.....	Sociology.....	The Sociology of Deviant Behavior: A monograph on the role of the tavern as an institution in contemporary society.	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Five translations (including reorganization and interpretation) of Max Weber's major works (Significant Contribution to American Sociological Theory):	Gerth, Hans M.
Do.....	do.....	From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, 1946.	
Do.....	do.....	Max Weber, The Religion in China: Confucianism and Taoism, 1951.	
Do.....	do.....	Max Weber, Ancient Judaism, 1952.	
Do.....	do.....	Max Weber, The Hindu Society, 1953.	
Do.....	do.....	Max Weber, The Religion of India: Buddhism and Hinduism, 1958.	
Do.....	do.....	Translation of Karl Mannheim's Freedom Power and Democratic Planning.....	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Character and Social Structure.....	Gerth, Hans M.; Mills, C. Wright.
Do.....	do.....	Translation of proceedings of the First International, 1958.....	Gerth, Hans.
Do.....	Anthropology.....	Methods and techniques for elucidating the migrations of peoples.	Laughlin, Wm. S.
Do.....	do.....	Intellectual achievements of Aleuts, as anatomy, medical, and health practices which constitute a major thematic element of their culture.	Laughlin and Marsh, G. H.
Do.....	do.....	Study of Idaho Basques, the interdependence of genetic phenomena and culturally directed systems of mating.	Gray, M. P.
Do.....	do.....	Improved existing techniques for the detection of blood group substances in skeleton enabling comparison of extinct populations with living survivors.	Do.
Social work.....	do.....	Comprehensive study for the division for children and youth, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare (currently).	Kadushian, Alfred.
Do.....	do.....	Interview Observations as a Teaching Device. 1956.....	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Social Legislation, revision of. 1957.....	Clarke, Helen I.
Do.....	do.....	American Social Work Theory. 1954.....	Miles, Arthur P.
Political science.....	Urban development.....	Urban development study: The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment; Urban Redevelopment: Problems and Practices. 1953.	Woodbury, Coleman.
Do.....	Foreign policy.....	English Government and foreign policy; Britain: Uneasy Ally. 1954.....	Epstein, Leon.
Do.....	Politics.....	Politics in Wisconsin (current).....	Do.

Examples of research in the social studies at the University of Wisconsin, 1948-58—Continued

Field	Subject	Title and/or content	Person
Political science	Foreign affairs	The Administration of American Foreign Affairs. 1950.	McCamy, James.
Do	Rivers: Social, political science.	Social and political problems connected with water resources and rivers: Dark Missouri (1957) and New India's Rivers (1956).	Hart, Henry.
Do	Russia.	Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-45 (1955); The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite (current), Soviet foreign policy, local administration, political research, and education. Communist movements outside Russia.	Armstrong, John.
Do	Tax	Tax administration, recently at State level. 1958.	Penniman, Clara.
Do	Legislation	Legislative behavior: regulation of the natural gas industry.	Huitt, Ralph.
Do	Latin America	Latin American politics and government; Latin American structure of power.	Stokes, Wm.
Do	Textbook	Revision of Ogg & Ray's text in American Government. 1957.	Young, Bill.
Do	do	On American Government.	McCamy, Jim.
Do	do	Basic text in field of international relations.	Pfankuchen, Llewellyn.
Do	Government	Local level problems of government in Wisconsin.	Bureau-Government, Donaghue, James.
Do	Civil rights	The Defendant's Rights, annual surveys of constitutional law. 1958.	Fellman, David.
Rural sociology		Concept of town-country in interdependence. How various specific rural institutions provide the basis for rural social structure and culture.	Koib, John H.
Do	Psychology	Study of child training as related to personality (challenged Freudian conception). Studies of factors associated with intelligence ratings and occupational choice of farm versus nonfarm children (dispelled erroneous notions of differences, while pointing up limitations of country environment).	Sewell, William.
Do	Population	The impact of population shifts into industrialized areas and the problems of out-migration in low-resource areas.	Marshall, Douglas.
Do	do	The mapping of nationality background of rural areas of Wisconsin.	Do.
Do	do	Technological change among farm people.	Wilkening, E. A.
Do	do	How family values and relationships affect decisions to adopt new farming techniques.	Do.
Do	Farm decision	The process of decision making in the farm family and how personal and family goals affect decisions on the farm and in the home. The role of county extension agents in Wisconsin.	Do.
Agriculture—Journalism	Terminology	Farmer understanding of some of the terminology used by soil specialists. 1957.	Agricultural Journalism Department.
Do	do	Farmer comprehension of graphs widely used to present price trends, market outlook and the like (current).	Do.
Agriculture—Economics	Farm management	The utilization of forage on the farm in order to minimize the cash outlays for purchased feeds. An economic evaluation of the application of fertilizers and the resulting crop responses. Studies of farm leases in order that equitable treatment may be accorded both proprietor and tenant. Studies of soil conservation and evaluation of soil conservation practices. The role of off-farm employment in rural development. The significance of credit in establishing young farmers on farms and as an effective production factor in operating older established farms.	Agricultural economics department.
Do	Marketing	Factors which make for low-cost farm production on dairy and hog producing farms (current). The significance of growing vegetables in relation to other enterprises on the farm (current). The pricing of veal calves (establishing practices give inadequate attention to calf grading). Marketing cull dairy cattle (the necessity of greater organization to improve farmer bargaining power, more information for farmers necessary to properly evaluate cull cattle for slaughter.) The marketing of nonfat milk solids. The problems and costs of bulk handling of milk. Procurement policies and practices of dairy processing firms, including price and nonprice competitive factors.	Do.
Do	Land economy	Costs and efficiencies of wholesale milk distribution in the Milwaukee market. Studies to ascertain consumer acceptance of (monster) concentrated milk. Changes in the market structure for potatoes in the North Central States. An analysis of the costs of providing rural electrical energy. The legal and economic aspects of water use. The utilization of lands in the Menominee Indian Reservation, including recreational uses and agricultural and forestry land divisions. Study dealing with recreational land and water in rural Wisconsin (current). The economic aspects of highway location in Wisconsin from the standpoint of the effect on farms and agricultural lands (current).	Do.
Do	Farm management	Measurement and appraisal of effects of agricultural programs on the dairy industry and on consumers.	Do.
Do	Marketing	Development and analysis of improving methods, techniques and practices in marketing eggs (current).	Do.
Agricultural economy	do	Pricing and trade practices for grain and grain products (current).	Do.
Geography	Urban	Costs and margins involved in the manufacture and marketing of rindless block and processed cheese (current). Changes in market structure large scale organization and operations in the dairy and vegetable processing industries (current).	Alexander, John V.
Do	do	Urban geographic theory, as the concept of economic base with case studies of cities.	Do.
Do	do	Changes of location of manufacturing in the United States.	Do.
Do	Historical	Freight-rate structures in Wisconsin. Study of the changing geographies of the Atlantic Provinces of Canada: Demonstration of the method and significance of historical geography as a dimension of economic and social history.	Clark, Andrew H.
Do	do	Historical geography of Prince Edward Island (1958).	Do.
Do	Political	World Patterns in Politics and Geography, the Challenge of Our Times; the Franco-German Boundary of 1871.	Hartshorne, Richard.
Do	Land use change	American Orchard and Vineyard Regions. How complex pattern of agricultural land use developed and cause over space through time.	Olmstead, Clarence W.
Do	Cartographer	A Method for Describing Quantitatively the Correspondence of Geographical Distributions.	Robinson, Arthur H.
Do	do	The Look of Maps: Theory and method of cartography as an essential tool in research and presentation in the social sciences.	Do.
Do	Cultural geography	Direction of major disciplinary project (field) of social and economic problems of Venezuelan Andes (valuation reports). Initiation of long-term study of frontier settlement in high latitudes from Scandinavian to Alaska.	Sterling, Henry S.
Do	Social anthropology	Papers and monographs on population of China, Africa, India, and Korea.	Stone, Kirk H.
Do	Rural sociology	Human and cultural geography of eastern and southern Asia particularly China, Korea, Japan, and India.	Glenn T. Trewartha.
Economics	Labor	Studies in history, nature and structure of trade unionism; the social security system; labor legislation; collective bargaining; the effects of trade union action on income distribution, prices, and employment.	Department of economics.
Do	Public finance	Studies on various types of taxation (income, property, and housing taxation). Tax administration and methods of improving compliance (including several Wisconsin tax system studies). Comparative tax studies (American to various foreign systems). Studies on the nature of business organizations (including public utilities) and their methods of costing and pricing.	Do.
Do	Economic development	Studies on the economic development of various foreign countries, their income distributing population, and foreign trade relations.	Do.
Do	International trade	A variety of studies on international trade, the terms of trade, and the structure of American foreign trade.	Do.
Do	Theory	Variety of studies. The behavior of the firm under conditions of competition, monopoly, and oligopoly. The factors influencing income distribution. Economic growth.	Do.
Do	History	The problem of unemployment and inflation and its causes and remedies. Studies on different aspects of economic history, especially the history of credit institutions and credit policy of various foreign countries.	Do.
Do	Intellectual history	The history of economic thought; several studies on the problem of the aged.	Do.
Commerce	do	Those factors in a State's environment and social climate that are attractive to industry.	Bureau of business research and service.
Do	Historical	The kinds of industries that have found Wisconsin's environment and social climate favorable.	Do.

Examples of research in the social studies at the University of Wisconsin, 1948-58—Continued

Field	Subject	Title and/or content	Person
Commerce	Legal subsidies	The effect of subsidies on industry to determine whether the community and State benefited from local policies of monetary incentive to industries being solicited.	Bureau of business research and service, Do.
Do.	do.	An Econometric Analysis of Construction; an attempt to apply mathematical formulas to explain the cyclical fluctuations of an industry.	
Journalism	American press history	Court records involving the freedom of press and the relationship of the press and Government during colonial times.	Nelson, Harold L.
Do.	Public relations	The historical standard in analyzing press performance.	
Do.	Civil liberties	The history of public relations in this country.	Cutlip, Scott.
Do.	Politics	A study of the treatment of new civil liberties in the press of the United States.	Higbie Charles F.
Do.	Television	The character and distribution of political information and comment presented by the press and radio of Wisconsin during recent lecture campaigns.	Higbie C. F.
Do.	News sources	Problems of educational television (involving areas of theory attitudes and reception of materials by listeners).	Westley Bruce H. and associates U. W.-T. V. Laboratory.
Do.	do.	The diffusion of news: the source of the information received by the people on unexpected events (including attitudes and affects of news.)	Danielson Wayne.
Do.	do.	Field surveys dealing with the interest of readers and listeners in various kinds of news.	School of journalism, Nafziger, R. O., director.
Education	Administration	The County Superintendent in Wisconsin. 1957.	Gregg, Russell T.
Do.	do.	A Study of the Intermediate Unit of Educational Administration (concluded intermediate unit is needed, present Wisconsin county superintendency is now inadequate to meet need; criteria for adequate intermediate unit established.)	Watson, George E.
Do.	Finance	State Financial Support and Educational Planning. 1953.	
Do.	Personal costs	Personal Expenditures for High School Education. 1951 (the nature and magnitude of costs to pupils attending Wisconsin secondary schools and the relationship of these costs to certain factors pertaining to the pupils, the family, and the school).	Fowlkes, John G.; Watson, George E.
Do.	Lay leadership	Identification and Utilization of Opinion Leaders in School District Reorganization, 1952 (ways and means of gaining and utilizing public opinion in the solution of educational problems).	Gregg, Russell T.; Schuit, R. E.
Do.	Finance	The formulation of State Public School Finance Policy in Wisconsin, 1954. (The roles of the legislature, Governor, superintendent of public instruction, supreme court, and special interest groups.)	Jensen, T. J.
Do.	Tax	The Shared Income Tax and Public School Support in Wisconsin, 1956. (Relation of States sharing of income tax with municipalities to the financing of education.)	Hornbostel, Victor D.
Do.	Administration	A 25-year longitudinal study of newly formed central school districts (1947-73).	Nygaard, J. M.
Do.	Skills	Studies in learning skills (including handwriting, reading, spelling and arithmetic).	Kreitlow, Burton.
Do.	Counseling	A 9-year study of the effect of counseling services on adolescents (guidance provides measurable help to students in making vocational and emotional adjustments after high school) (current).	Herick, V.; Harris, T.; Eberman, P.; Rarick, L.
Do.	Curriculum study habits	Studies in curricular patterns involving core curriculum, science and mathematics offerings, and study patterns of high-school students.	Rothney, John.
Do.	Higher education	Studies in higher education (current).	Krug, Edward; Little, Kenneth; Liddle, Clifford; Pella, Milton.
Do.	Audiovisual	The use of films in teaching high school physics (current).	Little, Liddle, Fowlkes.
Do.	Gifted and slow learners	Studies of slow learning and gifted children (current).	Wittick, Walter.
Do.	Gifted children	Study to improve techniques for early identification of highly gifted children with a special guidance clinic to help parents and teachers (current).	Jenson, Kai; Ringness, Thomas; Klausmeier, Herbert; Stanley, Julian.
Do.	Intergroup relations	Study of programs for democratic intergroup relations in the public schools.	Rothney, John, and School of Education.
Do.	Safety	Safety education project.	School of Education.
Do.	Aged	Liberal Education in an Age of Leisure, Explorations in the Development of Educational Programs for Older Adults (3-year research on changing life patterns of 50-year-old adults and over, and explorations in liberal education for individual growth, a nonvocational orientation) (current).	Elkow, J. Duke.
Psychology	Anxiety	The nature and measurement of anxiety (reactions of subjects to experimentally induced anxiety; reliability of heart rate change and skin electrical resistance as indices of moment to moment fluctuations in anxiety level and emotional response).	Kreitlow, Burton.
Do.	Therapeutic technique	The effect of different therapeutic techniques on mildly disturbed individuals (current).	Friedman, Eugene;
Do.	Psychotherapy	The physiological variations during the course of psychotherapy (implications for treatment for emotionally disturbed; better understanding of the process of personality and attitude change) (current).	Pooley, Robert;
Do.	Group problem solving	Factors influencing group problem solving finding that members of interdependent groups work harder on common group tasks than group members who reach their goals independently of each other. The variables that affect the judgments made by one person about another, finding that college students have more liking for judges who give them reliable information and less liking for unreliable judges, even though the latter give the students more favorable evaluations of their performance (current).	Thiele, Wilson;
Do.	Brain lesions	The effect of brain lesions upon various aspects of behavior of subhuman primates (sensory activity, learning, problem solving, etc.).	Shannon, Theodore.
Do.	Industrial psychology	The effects radioactive induced lesions upon various aspects of behavior of subhuman primates (preliminary results indicate such lesions may lead to total loss of learned behavior), followed by recovery (current).	Rogers, Carl R.;
Do.	do.	Years of research upon the intellectual capacities of subhuman primates (learning ability similar to young children or defective adults); the formation of "learning sets."	Martin, Barclay;
Do.	do.	The growth and behavior of the infant and young monkey (development of mechanical "pseudomothers"), emotional attachment of monkey to pseudomothers similar and as strong as that of response to real mother.	Lundy, Richard M.
Do.	do.	Refinement of measures of self-expressed interests for use in selection of sales personnel (current).	Do.
Do.	do.	The use of various psychological techniques to help in the solution of personnel problems in industry.	Rogers, Martin, and
Do.	do.	The difficulty of generalizing the applications of industrial psychology from one situation to another.	Glechrist, J. C.; Berko-
Do.	do.	Opinion surveys of industrial employees.	witz, L. N.
Do.	do.	Personnel selection for industry.	Harlow, Harry P.; Mas-

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from the South Dakota adjutant of the American Legion, Walter Travis, pertaining to the proposed closing of one ward in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Sioux Falls due to budgetary limitations.

This telegram expresses the opposition of the State department of the American

Legion in South Dakota to the closing of the ward. The telegram is a formal resolution adopted by the Legion in its State convention just ended.

I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that a similar problem affects many hospitals of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country. I particularly wish to urge that the Appropriations Committee give the matter its early attention.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield, if I have the right to do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the same question has been called to my

attention; and I took it up with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Whittier. I know there will be a reconsideration of the Executive order in regard to the proposed closing of the various units of Veterans' Administration hospitals, because at no time have I not had in my files or on my desk letters from veterans or their families who seek admission to hospitals, but who invariably are told by the hospital authorities, "We have no space for you."

Therefore, I cannot concur in the proposed closing of any sections or wards or divisions of Veterans' Administration hospitals, in that their closing would deny to veterans who are in great need of hospital care an opportunity to be hospitalized.

So I have worked on the matter. Last evening I obtained information—in fact, I released it to the press—in regard to the Veterans' Administration hospital in Minneapolis and the fact that there will be no closing of any ward or section of that unit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am particularly glad to have that comment by the Senator from Minnesota, because the ward closing to which the order is directed is in the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which is immediately adjacent to southwestern Minnesota; and a great many veterans in Minnesota have been hospitalized at that hospital. In fact, a considerable portion of the people of southwestern Minnesota look to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., to supply veterans' hospital facilities for some of those patients.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield further to me, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the press release I issued last evening.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator EDWARD J. THYE (Republican of Minnesota) received support of his position concerning beds recently made available at the Fort Snelling Veterans Hospital in St. Paul, Minn. Sumner Whittier, Director of the Veterans' Administration wrote Senator THYE on June 24, to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget had reversed its earlier position on the matter.

A total of 23 beds, formerly used in the tuberculosis ward, were transferred to general and surgical patient use as a result of the Bureau of the Budget approval. The beds had been closed because of the decline in the number of tuberculosis patients.

Senator THYE had supported the position of the Veterans' Administration and had held for Bureau of the Budget approval.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in addition to the current need for medical attention for our veterans, as cited in the telegram, I should like to point out to the Senate that once service is curtailed in any of the Veterans' Administration hospitals it is almost impossible to regain the service when needs become more urgent.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will take action to keep open every Veterans' Administration hospital ward in the country, including the one at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. If the Veterans' Admin-

istration has not given a complete picture on its budget needs to the Appropriations Committee, it should be directed to do so at once.

Our veteran population is growing, and its medical needs are increasing. It is inconceivable to me that in the face of that situation restrictions which would decrease the service would be imposed on our Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of the resolution which was transmitted to me by telegram from the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, meeting in Huron, S. Dak., at its annual State convention the forepart of this week.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HURON, S. DAK., June 24, 1958.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion Department convention meeting here Tuesday, June 24, adopted this resolution and directed that copy of it be dispatched to you immediately:

"Whereas the rehabilitation of our disabled comrades is the first concern of the American Legion; and

"Whereas we have been advised that there is now a proposal to reduce the operating plan of the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Hospital located at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., from an operating plan of 270 beds to 247 beds; and

"Whereas this will result in the abandonment of ward 3 north with a rated bed capacity of 43 beds; and

"Whereas as the result of a careful investigation it has been determined that a reduction of the bed capacity from 270 available beds to 247 beds for treatment of veterans residing in the eastern half of South Dakota, the southwestern section of Minnesota, the northwestern section of Iowa, and the northeastern section of Nebraska will not be adequate for this purpose; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has expressed themselves as being cognizant of this and has increased the proposed appropriation for the financing of Veterans' Administration hospitals by increasing the proposed amount provided for that purpose from \$700 million to \$717 million; and

"Whereas it is our considered opinion that this sum is still not sufficient to maintain the high standard of medical care for the veterans of this area without the reduction of a number of beds when the increased costs of supplies, drugs, wage board increases in salary, and additional expense including civil-service retirement and accumulated annual leave is taken into consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this 40th Convention of the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, That our Congressional delegation be advised of our objection to the proposed reduction of presently rated bed capacity and that they make every effort to provide sufficient funds to properly operate all Veterans' Administration hospitals and especially the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., at the rated bed capacity of 270 general medical and surgical beds: It is further

"Resolved, That our Congressional delegation from South Dakota be immediately advised of the above information and that they be asked to use every possible effort to provide sufficient funds to maintain the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Hospital at a bed capacity of not less than 270 beds and that they use every effort to prevent the closing of any ward in the Royal C. John-

son Memorial Hospital thereby insuring adequate and proper care of the veterans in need of hospitalization in this area; and it is further urged that sufficient and adequate funds be provided for the operation of existing 255 general medical and surgical beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Hot Springs, S. Dak., and for the operation of 720 N. P. beds at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Meade, S. Dak."

WALTER TRAVIS,
Department Adjutant.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF OPERATIONS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me, so that I may propound a question to the acting majority leader?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the question I should like to ask the acting majority leader is this: The life of the Small Business Administration will expire in July; but its loaning authority, as I understand, will expire on June 30. Therefore, the Small Business Administration is faced with the question of what to do with loan applications which will come before it.

Under the circumstances, I should like to ask the acting majority leader about the plan in regard to the taking of action to extend the life of the Small Business Administration. When can we hope to have action on that matter taken?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The plan of the leadership is to consider that measure following the completion of action on the Alaskan statehood bill. When the Alaskan statehood bill will be disposed of, I do not know. But I express the hope—the cautious hope, I may say—that our action on that bill will be completed by the end of this week. However, I would not bet on that.

As soon as our action on the Alaskan statehood bill is completed, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Minnesota has shown such great interest.

Mr. THYE. If the measure to extend the life of the Small Business Administration will be considered following the completion of action by the Senate on the Alaskan statehood bill, then—judging from the number of Senators who have expressed a desire to speak on that bill, and in view of the debate on it which we can anticipate—I question whether it will be possible for the Senate to act on the Small Business Administration bill this week.

Next Monday will be June 30; and at that time the loaning authority of the Small Business Administration will have expired, and then a handicap will have been placed on the operations of the Small Business Administration. I do not believe that would be wise procedure. On yesterday, I said to some of my colleagues that it would not take long to debate the Small Business Administra-

tion bill. Personally, I am strongly in favor of a permanent extension of the life of the Small Business Administration; and an amendment on that subject is pending. I said it would not take me more than 10 or 15 minutes to state the reasons why I believe the agency should be made a permanent one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It may not be a wise procedure, but it is not unusual procedure. It happens at almost every session; and there is nothing to prevent any such legislation, once it is enacted, from being retroactive to the date of expiration of the preceding legislation.

On yesterday, when I was approached about this measure, I was given assurances that it could be considered in 5 or 10 minutes, without much debate, and without any yea-and-nay votes. But later I found that there were hindrances to be considered; and on that basis it was decided that the Senate would proceed with consideration of the Alaskan statehood bill, and that the Small Business Administration bill would be brought up immediately following the completion of action by the Senate on the Alaskan statehood bill.

I know the Senator from Minnesota is greatly interested in the Small Business Administration bill and wishes to have the agency made a permanent one. His position is well known, and I am in accord with his views. But I believe it the better procedure for the Senate to continue at this time with consideration of the Alaskan statehood bill.

Mr. THYE. Of course it is certain that when June 30 comes, the agency will not be able to approve any loan applications, because its lending authorization will then have ended. Therefore, the life of the agency is virtually in jeopardy, in that then it will not be able to function.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. THYE. If a continuing resolution is required, I shall submit such a resolution to this body. Certainly no debate would be required in connection with a resolution to extend the life of the agency for 30 days; and by so doing we would not jeopardize its ability to approve loans and to make loans and to continue to function in a normal way.

So if there is no assurance that action on this matter will be taken today, I shall submit a resolution; but I repeat that it would not take me more than 15 minutes to make known my reasons for requesting the adoption of my amendment to make the agency a permanent one, and then the Senate could vote the amendment either up or down. There is a committee bill which proposes a 3-year extension, and the House has passed a permanent legislative authorization. So if my amendment were adopted the bill would be immediately ready for conference or immediate Presidential signature.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express the hope that the chairman of the Small Business Committee and his committee will have a resolution ready on Monday, if the Senate has not proceeded to the consideration of the bill at that time.

Mr. THYE. I am now having drafted a resolution, which I shall submit at a

later time. It is not in my possession at this time. Then the Senate could act on the resolution.

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I desire to refer to a telegram I received from George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, with an address here in Washington. The telegram reads:

Acting officially on authority of our nationwide membership, approximately 100,000 independent business and professional men—all voting members—in my appearances before Banking Committee of the Congress, 1953, we recommended SBA be made a permanent agency. Similar position taken before the Congressional Banking Committee, 1958. In our appearances before platform committees of Democratic and Republican National Conventions in Chicago and San Francisco, 1956, we recommended the agency be made a permanent agency. In five national polls of our entire membership through the mandate, each poll disclosed majority membership vote overwhelmingly in favor of making SBA a permanent agency. Bear in mind this is no individual officer speaking, but the grassroots. All small business and professional men trust that the Senate at this time will recognize the voice of small business representing independent businessmen from the majority of States in the Union and will make SBA a permanent agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite sure the acting majority leader will have a fluid attitude toward this matter—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I had the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Minnesota to ask a question. I shall be glad to yield, but I want unanimous consent that it does not constitute one speech on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure the acting majority leader will remain fluid on this matter. If there is a convenient point today or tomorrow in which to include consideration of the measure extending the Small Business Administration, I am confident he will entertain the matter and try to expedite it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, provided it can be done on a 5- or 10-minute basis, with no amendments, and no rollcalls.

POSSIBILITY OF VISIT BY HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS SARDAR MOHAMMAD DAUD, PRIME MINISTER OF AFGHANISTAN, AT 3 O'CLOCK TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for an announcement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield with the same understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership has been informed that His Royal Highness Sardar Mohammad Daud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, will pay an official visit to the Senate at 3 o'clock this afternoon. It is the hope of the leadership that at that time

the Prime Minister of Afghanistan will make a few remarks and that the Senate will take a recess shortly afterwards. This is merely the announcement of a possibility to the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

THE 160-ACRE LIMITATION OF THE RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may yield to me briefly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, and that it will not be construed that I have made 2 speeches on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, on Monday the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a unanimous opinion in the so-called *Ivanhoe* case, involving the 160-acre limitation in the reclamation law, which is of great importance to all States in which there are irrigation projects. In fact, the importance of the decision is even broader than that, because it will have an effect on all water resource development programs in which the Federal Government participates.

The *Ivanhoe* case arose over the refusal of the Supreme Court of the State of California to confirm contracts for the delivery of water by means of federally constructed facilities to the *Ivanhoe* Irrigation District and other water agencies forming a part of the Central Valley project, one of the greatest single irrigation projects ever undertaken by man. The California court had held that the contracts, to which the Secretary of the Interior was a party, were invalid because the 160-acre limitation was contrary to California State law.

Squarely at issue was section 5 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, providing that "no right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one landowner," and section 8 of the same act, which provides that the statute is not to be "construed as affecting or intending to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation." It further provides that in administering the act the Secretary of the Interior shall proceed in conformity with State water rights.

Interpreting this latter section, section 8 of the 1902 Reclamation Act, the California court reasoned that "when-ever there is a conflict between the Federal reclamation laws and the laws of the State, the law of California must prevail."

The United States Supreme Court, however, in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Clark, held that section 8 "merely requires the United States to comply with State law when, in the construction

and operation of a reclamation project, it becomes necessary for it to acquire water rights or vested interests therein." The Court then asserts:

"The acquisition of water rights must not be confused with the operation of Federal projects," and goes on to uphold the 160-acre limitation as insuring that Federal expenditures for reclamation will "not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holdings. Moreover, it prevents the use of the Federal Reclamation Service for speculative purposes."

However, Mr. President, there is nothing whatever in the opinion that indicates that the 160-acre limitation is in any way sacred in itself. On the contrary, the Court specifically recognizes the power of Congress to change the limitation or to exempt certain projects from it, as we did in the 83d Congress in the Santa Maria project. It should be made clear to every Member of the Senate that, in many areas, 160 acres will not produce enough to support a family under today's costs for machinery, transportation, and labor.

I am glad to see sitting in the position of acting minority leader the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who has been one of the chief students of the 160-acre limitation, and who is the author of proposed legislation pertaining to the 160-acre limitation. In the recent hearings which I was privileged to conduct as chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming made what I think is a most valuable contribution to the thinking on this subject.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. First, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very kind words. I may say to him that I have read the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called *Ivanhoe* case. As the Court very clearly pointed out, Congress has reserved the right to waive, and has on numerous occasions waived, the limitation of the act for specific projects.

The situation in the Mountain States is entirely different from that in other areas of the country. The 160-acre limitation will not permit a farmer to support a family, in many cases, in short growing seasons, where the lands are located in high altitudes. Certainly Congress is acting wisely when it exempts certain projects from the so-called limitation.

Also, I was very much pleased that the Court quite clearly pointed out the distinction between the rule on the 160-acre limitation and the question of the right of the States to control and dispose of the waters. Certainly nothing was said in the opinion which would indicate in the least that the States were not acting wholly within their rights in controlling the disposition of the waters. As Justice Clark pointed out in the decision, the Bureau of Reclamation should go to the States to acquire any water rights it may desire or need for the project in question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy the Senator from Wyoming has made

that statement. I was about to say that immediately upon the announcement of the *Ivanhoe* decision, many telephone calls came to the committee and to me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, asking, "Are we to understand that the Supreme Court laid down the edict that the 160-acre limitation is sacred, that Congress cannot change it, and that it must apply to every irrigation project?"

It was that concern which prompted me to say today that although the Supreme Court acted, it did not make any ruling of that nature. I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming, having read the opinion, will agree with me.

Mr. BARRETT. I certainly agree that that understanding is clearly within the rule laid down by the Supreme Court in the *Ivanhoe* case. I say to the Senator from New Mexico now, as I have said to him privately, that I am hopeful his subcommittee will report the bill which will authorize a limitation higher than 160 acres for the Seedskadee project in my State. It is one of the units of the Upper Colorado River Basin project which will be ready for construction later this year or early next year; but before it can be feasible, the Bureau of Reclamation indicates that it will be necessary to enact legislation authorizing more than 160 acres, so that the farmers can go onto the project and make a living for themselves and their families.

I hope the Senator's subcommittee will report to the full committee the bill which I have introduced, exempting the Seedskadee project from the limitations of the act, at least so far as was recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. ANDERSON. That recommendation has been made. So far as the chairman of the subcommittee is concerned, he is cognizant of that problem, and he subscribes to what the Senator from Wyoming has just said, namely, that in the particular project referred to, where the elevations are high and the growing seasons are very short, and therefore where the types of agriculture is somewhat limited, there seems to be a need for the exemption of the project.

A number of bills are before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation which attempt to deal with the problem in different ways. Hearings have been held on these matters, and sharp differences have developed. It is my hope that it will be possible to report specialized bills dealing individually with these problems, and that any questions relating to the general proposal of a 160-acre limitation may be resolved.

As the Senator from Wyoming knows, I early supported the project in the San Luis Valley of Colorado, where the elevation is about 5,000 feet, and where 160 acres would only permit a man to starve slowly. I tried to help, in that instance, to provide a sufficient-sized farming operation so that an individual could support himself very well.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the position which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has taken on the proposed legislation. I have not been able to discern any difference of opinion

between himself and myself on this question.

The sole purpose of the bills is to make it possible for a veteran or someone else to locate on these irrigated projects and at that time be able to support himself and his family. Certainly there would be no point in settling a farmer on a project where he had no chance whatever to make a living.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly correct. The Riverton project, in the Senator's State, illustrates what happens when a veteran is given a piece of ground and is given an opportunity to starve slowly, rather than to starve rapidly.

The project has very wisely, under the guidance of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and his colleague [Mr. O'MAHONEY], been broadened so as to make it possible for the settlers to exist. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, not only for his contribution today, but for his steady contributions in this field.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there are before the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, a number of bills which attempt to deal with the problem in different ways. Hearings have been held on these measures, and sharp differences of opinion developed.

Justice Clark's opinion will, I believe, be of assistance to the members of the committee and to the Senate in dealing with these pieces of pending legislation. In order that it may be conveniently available, the text of the opinion will be printed as a committee print by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with appropriate introductory statements setting it forth in proper fashion.

Mr. President, I say that because we have already received requests asking whether copies of the opinion can be obtained from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and I want the Members of the Senate and also the Members of the House to know that the opinion will be available and will be circulated, in order that it may be studied by all who are interested in irrigation.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask that the remarks I have made and the comments by the Senator from Wyoming be printed in the *RECORD* preceding the address by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for an insertion in the *RECORD*, with the understanding that his rights will not be damaged?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield for an insertion in the *RECORD*, provided I do not lose the floor, and provided it does not count as a speech on my part.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have before me an excellent editorial from the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express

for Thursday, June 12, 1958, entitled "Will of the People." It makes a strong and convincing case in favor of statehood for Alaska. It reminds those who read it that the people of the United States have favored Alaskan statehood, in polls which have been taken, by a ratio of 12 to 1. It suggests one of the controversies here present—which ought not to be present—is an apprehension on the part of some that Alaska may add, under statehood status, two Senators whose allegiance will be to the Democratic Party.

Here is one Republican Senator who devotedly hopes Alaska will be admitted to the Union, and that subsequently Hawaii, too, will be admitted to the Union exactly as the platforms of both great political parties have promised the American people. Here is a Republican Senator who contends that the partisan complexion of the Territory of Alaska is completely irrelevant in determining whether this Territory should be admitted. I hope very much that the overwhelming majority of my Republican colleagues agree with me. I commend this editorial to them and to my Democratic colleagues as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be incorporated in the RECORD as one more persuasive piece of evidence that Alaska statehood is long overdue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

On May 28, the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives in favor of Alaskan statehood (208 to 168), reflected the will of the people of America.

Thus, Alaska regained the same position it held 8 years ago in its long quest for entry into the Union.

At that time, March 3, 1950, the House had okayed Alaskan statehood. The bill went on to defeat in the Senate.

Once again this bill comes to the floor of the Senate, possibly this week or next. The sides are drawn and, unfortunately—victory for Alaska will not come easily.

The heart of the present controversy is whether the balance of power in the Senate will be upset, Alaska being a Democratic stronghold, and sure to add two Senators to the Democratic majority.

This is the main stumbling block and, from where we sit, the highest legislative body of the land appears rather undignified in its inability to surmount it.

President Eisenhower, in an effort to resolve this bickering over representation, reminded the Republican Senators of their party's platform pledge of Alaskan statehood.

But perhaps the Senators would do best to remember that in cross-country polls, the people have favored Alaskan statehood 12 to 1.

This fact alone should end the hesitancy on the part of any Senator in voting in favor of Alaska's statehood.

These men have been placed in office by the people to carry out the will of the people.

We trust the Senators will remember this obligation and vote accordingly when the Alaskan statehood bill comes before them.

POLITICAL IMMORALITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me, with the understanding that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield under the same conditions as I yielded to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a column which appeared this morning, written by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Congress Reforms: Cleaning Up Own Actions Urged." I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS REFORMS: CLEANING UP OWN ACTIONS URGED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It will be hypocrisy of the worst kind if the politicians succeed in filling the air with such virtuous condemnation of Sherman Adams that they can hide behind their own pretensions and turn aside basic reforms which need to apply to themselves as much, if not more, than to many others.

The present tactic, apparently, is to so bedevil the issue with moral finger-pointing at Mr. Adams that Members of Congress can conceal their own gift, campaign contribution, conflict-of-interest habits, which dwarf those they so piously deplore, and end by conveniently neglecting the remedies.

The politicians love to dispense scapegoats as long as they can escape themselves. The elected Republicans orate about General Vaughan and the elected Democrats orate about Sherman Adams even though their own offenses are more pernicious.

One courageous voice is being raised in the Senate this week to expose this conspiracy of mutual tolerance among politicians and to condemn this protective device they have against ever looking into the mirror at what they themselves do.

The voice is that of the liberal Democratic Oregon Senator, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who asks these pertinent questions:

"When Sherman Adams committed his errors of judgment in doing favors for his friend, the public is being left to infer that he did this because of Mr. Goldfine's coats and hotel suites. Yet is Sherman Adams any more indebted to Mr. Goldfine for gifts than a man who sits in the Senate or in a Governor's chair is indebted to those who collected \$100,000 from big businessmen or from trade-union political-education funds for his campaign expenses?"

"Is Sherman Adams, with his \$2400 rug and \$700 vicuna cloth coat more obligated to render unethical favors than is a Member of Congress who is dependent every few years on 20 times that amount from bankers, natural gas and private utility owners and distillery executives to finance his billboards and radio and TV shows?"

"Is it morality for a Senator to collect \$500 or \$1000 speaking fees from many labor unions or liberal groups and then to oppose a Federal right-to-work law, but immorality for Harry Vaughan at the White House to be given a deep freeze or Mr. Adams a coat?"

Senator NEUBERGER is not extenuating Mr. Adams' mistake. (Mr. Adams had the decency to admit his own imprudence.) Mr. NEUBERGER is pointing out that "Mr. Adams is the victim of a system" under which the spending of large sums of money on politics and on politicians is widely taken for granted and he would like to see the politicians do a little something about the system itself besides moralizing at everyone but themselves.

There are three practical reforms which would reach in the right direction.

The regulatory agencies ought to be put out of the reach of influence-pressure by both legislative and executive officials. At the very least it should be a punishable offense if any approach is made that is not a part of the public record.

Presidential and Congressional elections ought to be freed from massive contributions, which often involve underworld money, lobby money, and appointment-hungry money. President Theodore Roosevelt once suggested that election costs should be defrayed by the Government. The Advertising Council of America is this year undertaking to raise election funds for both parties from millions of contributors. That would be good. Finally, is there any reason why Congressmen should not apply the same laws against "conflict of interest" to themselves that they apply to others in Government and provide for disclosure of their own gifts and outside income?

Senator NEUBERGER's central question is very much to the point: Why is it that great and unctuous breast-beating rises in Congress over rugs, hotel bills and deep freezes but strange silence prevails about millions of dollars given to elect Presidents or a \$500,000 fund to put a Senator in office?

Perhaps the politicians hope the voters won't begin to ask questions like this. I think they will.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Drummond, typical of many of the newspapermen writing today on the Adams case, owes it to his readers to point out some of the distinctions between concealed gifts and public, recorded campaign contributions. The senior Senator from Oregon thinks the time has come for the smear artists to put up or shut up in respect to alleged violations of conflict of interests by Members of the Congress of the United States. No one will fight harder to clean up any proven conflict of interests on the part of any Member of Congress than the senior Senator from Oregon. But, Mr. President, I am a little weary of snide attacks on the Congress without a bill of particulars backing up the attacks. That goes for Mr. Drummond and it goes for the Washington Post and it goes for other newspapers which are trying to place actions of Members of Congress in the same class with the unethical conduct of one Mr. Sherman Adams.

Mr. President, I will support, as I said in my speech yesterday, any program which seeks to improve the election laws of this country in respect to campaign contributions; but it is about time that someone pointed out what happens to campaign contributions. They are a matter of public record. Information about them is made available to the voters of a State with laws such as Oregon and the voters of the State have a list of the contributions made public. In my State, certain information on campaign contributions has to be published in advance of election. We know the requirement of the Senate is that a report on campaign contributions must be made public 10 days before an election.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday, it is a part of our democratic system that individuals in our society contribute to a candidate's finance committee. This ought to be pointed out by newspapermen who are constantly showing ignorance as to how campaign

funds are raised, as indicated by the kind of stories they are writing. Many of them are misleading the public and giving the impression that Members of Congress act under a conflict of interests in respect to campaign contributions. They fail to document their charges.

Some of us, Mr. President, take great pride in the fact that we sit here, as our voting record shows, and exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of proposed legislation as it comes before us.

Mr. Drummond makes reference to a right-to-work bill. Why is he not fair enough to point out that in the Senate of the United States, for example, time and time again, Senators cast their votes despite the attempt on the part of the press to give a different impression, quite contrary to what happens to be the selfish interest of some group which may have contributed to their campaigns.

Mr. President, campaign contributions by and large are not made to candidates for office. Contributions are made to the campaign committee of the man running for office. The campaign contributions do not make a man a conservative or a liberal. The man is a conservative or a liberal at the time he announces his candidacy for the Senate or for the House of Representatives. It is only natural, under our democratic processes, that conservative groups and individuals contribute to conservative candidates, while liberal groups and individuals contribute to liberal candidates.

May I say, for the benefit of Mr. Drummond and the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. President, that what we need to do, of course, is to adopt some election reforms along the line of the Neuberger bill, of which I happen to be a cosponsor; or the Hennings bill, which I have supported; or the Douglas bill, which I have supported from the beginning; or the Morse bill.

The Morse bill I may say for the benefit of the Washington Post and Times-Herald, has been introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Oregon since 1946. The bill would require a public disclosure of all the sources and amounts of income and gifts of members, not only of the Congress, but of the executive branch of the Government as well.

Mr. President, the great difference we are talking about is the difference between the public disclosure which goes along with campaign contributions, known to the voters as they come to evaluate the candidates for office, and concealed gifts, which may represent a conflict of interest as in the Adams case.

Mr. President, this is no new problem for the senior Senator from Oregon. I have somewhat of a sense of humor about it. I will say for the RECORD, since it indicates the policy I have followed with respect to gifts, that in 1956 there was an individual of some wealth who thought perhaps I would accept gifts for my farm in Maryland. Although I had told him I would not accept any gifts, he had some livestock which he wanted to give to me. I said I would buy the stock at the market value, if he wanted

to sell it, but that he could not give it to me. I have a delightful friend, who enjoys my hobby with me on the farm, and without my permission he permitted the livestock to come on to the farm. The proposed donor was notified that unless he got the livestock off the farm within 3 days it would be delivered, at his expense, to the Meadowbrook Saddle Club at Rock Creek Park. I made clear to him, both by letter and word, that I do not accept gifts of substantial value and I wanted the livestock off the farm forthwith. The livestock was taken off immediately.

I mention that, Mr. President, because I think the position I took in that instance is the position which Member of Congress after Member of Congress is constantly taking. Those who think to the contrary had better come forward with a bill of particulars backing up their insinuations against the Congress.

I say that also for the benefit of some of the gentlemen in the Press Gallery who seem to think that the Adams case gives them an opportunity now, by innuendo and insinuation, to smear the Congress. I do not participate in, nor shall I remain silent about, that kind of nest-fouling tactics, whether by a Member of Congress or by a member of the press.

I say today that I think the record of the Congress is a remarkably fine record of freedom from conflict of interest. Surely there are glaring examples now and then, but the interesting thing is that when such are brought forth to the public view, the public takes care of the culprit.

We have a responsibility for some election reform laws. We have a responsibility to make Members of Congress subject to the conflict-of-interest laws. I have always supported such proposals and shall continue to do so.

At the same time, let me say, Mr. President, that in my judgment the immorality of a Sherman Adams is no justification for an attempt to besmirch the Congress, which is, of course, subject to the check of the ballot box, which is one of the most effective means of producing good behavior in the Congress of the United States. All Members of Congress, as I said yesterday, live in a glass house—and they should. I am in favor of the spotlight of public attention focused upon the Congress and any Member of Congress in case of any provable misbehavior.

But, Mr. President, in the Adams case, in my judgment, there is a clear case of wrongdoing. I do not think any Member of Congress can justify any failure to take action against Adams because there may have been an unknown case of misbehavior on the part of a Member of Congress. Produce such a case, and the senior Senator from Oregon will then take exactly the same position against wrongdoing on the part of a Member of Congress. I may say for the benefit of Mr. Drummond or anybody else in the Press Gallery, as he takes with respect to Mr. Sherman Adams.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have sent to the

Attorney General calling for an investigation on the part of the Department of Justice of the Adams case.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 25, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In a speech in the Senate of the United States on June 24, 1958, I raised the question as to whether or not Mr. Edward F. Howrey had violated section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act as a result of certain information which he had supplied Mr. Sherman Adams, as brought out by the hearings of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 17.

I also raised the question as to whether Mr. Adams had not violated the law in respect to his course of conduct in relation to the Federal Trade Commission as disclosed by the hearings of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am enclosing tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which set forth the comments on this matter which I made in the Senate. You will note that in that speech I stated, "It is my intention to call upon the present membership of the Federal Trade Commission to see to it that that violation of its statute by its former Chairman, Mr. Edward F. Howrey, is called to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States, for action. In order that there can be no misunderstanding, however, I am also calling this matter to the attention of Mr. William P. Rogers, the Attorney General, so that there can be no mishap or failure to consider the prosecution of Mr. Howrey for his overt violation of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act."

I respectfully call this matter to your attention. If a thorough legal examination of the Howrey and Adams incidents indicate that either one or both of these officials violated the law, I am confident that you will proceed with appropriate legal action.

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

TACONITE: SUCCESS IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—
Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota under the same conditions on which I yielded to the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last weekend I had the privilege of addressing an audience at Babbitt, Minn., at a banquet commemorating the discovery of taconite by Peter Mitchell 87 years ago, and the founding of the town of Babbitt itself.

It was a pleasure to renew my acquaintance with such old friends as Mayor Ben P. Constantine, of Babbitt; Dr. E. W. Davis—"Mr. Taconite" himself—and Mr. William Kelley, president of Reserve Mining Co., the industrial pioneer in the field of taconite concentration.

My remarks on that occasion reflected not only upon the development of taconite production itself, but also upon the

lessons which a free society can learn from this tremendous and successful undertaking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Taconite: Success in a Free Society," given at Babbitt, Minn., on June 21, 1958, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the program printed prior to the address.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BABBITT PIONEERS' BANQUET HONORING BABBITT PIONEERS AND COMMEMORATING DISCOVERY OF TACONITE BY PETER MITCHELL, SATURDAY EVENING, JUNE 22, 1958, BABBITT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Invocation: Rev. Fr. George Kryspin, St. Plus X Catholic Church.

America: Audience, directed by Mrs. Ida-mae Kaatiala.

Toastmaster: George A. Moe, superintendent of schools.

Welcome: Mayor Ben P. Constantine.
Remarks: William Kelley, president, Reserve Mining Co.

Remarks: Dr. E. W. Davis, Reserve Mining Co.

Introduction of guests: Toastmaster.

Remarks: Mrs. Lillis Stowe, for Peter Mitchell family.

Presentation of certificates to Pioneers: Mrs. Leo Ducharme, chairman, Pioneers' committee.

Introduction of speaker: Mayor Constantine.

Address: Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator.

Closing prayer: Rev. Virgil Smith, Woodland Presbyterian Church.

TACONITE: SUCCESS IN A FREE STATE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Babbitt, Minn., June 21, 1958)

Few events in the history of this State are of greater historical significance than the discovery 87 years ago of iron-bearing rock right here near Babbitt. It is particularly fitting that this taconite works has been named after Peter Mitchell, whose discovery touched off the first acquisition of taconite lands in northern Minnesota, and began the long chain of events resulting in the first production of taconite pellets at the E. W. Davis Works less than 3 years ago.

It is impossible to single out all those whose courage and vision and skill have contributed to the creation of this entirely new concept in mining. Surely there is honor and distinction enough for all. Yet it would be difficult to overestimate the role of the one man without whose genius there would simply have been no taconite industry today, and after whom the first commercial taconite agglomeration plant at Silver Bay was so aptly named.

Prof. E. W. Davis, still very much in evidence throughout the taconite area wherever important decisions are being made and where new experiments are being tried, deserves the gratitude of our Nation, as well as of our Minnesota iron range.

It was his rocklike perseverance—as hard and enduring as the taconite rock itself—that gave direction and significance to the efforts of mining engineers, political leaders, investors, and skilled labor, and spurred the great decisions to invest literally hundreds of millions of dollars in a new kind of industrial enterprise.

Dr. E. W. Davis is one of the great men in Minnesota's first hundred years, and I take real pride in saying this. He is the living demonstration of the idea that progress results only from dedicated research. Everything stems from the idea. And it was the

idea burning in Professor Davis' mind at the University of Minnesota that finally ignited the imagination and energies of hundreds and thousands of his fellow Minnesotans and fellow Americans. It was the idea, held fast through 40 years, that gave birth to these giant machines, these incredible complexes of men and machinery here at Babbitt, at Silver Bay, at Aurora, and at Taconite Harbor.

It is his idea still that leads men to plan for a taconite industry eventually producing 30 million tons annually on the Minnesota iron range, employing more men, providing more income for families than was ever possible in the best days of the direct-shipment ore.

Few events in history have ever demonstrated more clearly the necessity for planning early and planning well than the early research efforts on the taconite process and the complicated political and economic planning which took place, most of it, over 10 years before any construction was begun. How important it was that men of vision pointed out a generation ago, and without pause, have continued to stress that the Minnesota iron range of the old days, the range with unlimited supplies of direct-shipping iron ore, would not last forever.

Their prophecies have been borne out.

Today the direct shipping ore is running low. If we had not been alerted years ago by the taconite pioneers, and if we had not had the political leadership of such men as Congressman John Blatnik, Tom Vukelich, Fred Cina, Bill Hutila, and others, the future of the Minnesota iron range today would be much less encouraging. In recent years that effective political leadership has been augmented by legislators such as Pete Fugina and Loren Rutter.

The pattern of the steel industry is changing very rapidly. Just in the last few years, vast new direct-shipping deposits of iron ore have been developed, not only in Labrador, but in Venezuela. There is clearly a major new development taking place in Brazil this year.

The most recent estimates by a special study mission from the International Cooperation Administration indicates that within 10 years the Brazilian iron ore production will possibly triple to about 4 million tons total. Fortunately, much of this expanded production will be needed and used in other parts of the world. The tremendous worldwide industrialization program now underway will require vastly increased output of iron ore for years to come.

The percentage of imported iron ore continues to rise, even during those years when steel production falls below its peaks, and even when there is a tremendous drop in steel production such as has taken place during the past few months. This pattern, in which some steel companies continue to increase their imports of direct-shipping iron ore, making their cutbacks in the iron range of Minnesota, is very disturbing to me. Congressman BLATNIK and I have joined with Governor Freeman and other State leaders in encouraging those sections of the leadership of the steel industry which have been cutting back the percentage of operations on the Minnesota iron range (in favor of increased operations in foreign ores) to speed their plans for taconite development here in Minnesota.

If these elements of the steel industry continue to postpone development of domestic taconite production capacity, they are going to force the Congress to give serious consideration to proposals for restricting iron-ore imports, possibly through a system of flexible quotas operative in years of low steel production.

But, above all, the problem of the Minnesota iron range, and of the taconite industry itself on the iron range this year, is the same problem faced by our whole Nation.

The recession, with its tremendously reduced purchasing power and the consequent drop in the demand for steel to something like one-half, is the major problem. Men and women are out of work all over this country, and I am very frankly discouraged about the way the administration has moved to alleviate these conditions. The difference between a short recession and a long recession and perhaps a depression, you know, is largely in the way the President and the Congress react to the recession. If they move to restore purchasing power and to create new jobs and new business opportunities through Federal programs and tax reductions, the recession can be checked. There are tremendous built-in powers and controls available to the President, if he will but use them.

Therefore, in the short range (that is, for the next year or two) what happens to employment and production on the Minnesota iron range is going to be determined in a large part by the policies of Government and their effect on the national economy.

For the long pull, for the decades to come, I am far more optimistic. This Nation is still expanding. Our people are still growing. Our resources are still vast. Our technology is improving. There is a natural buoyancy and vigor in our people which will, given half a chance, result in even higher living standards in the coming decades.

This means, that steel production is going to be increasing over the coming years. Even more iron ore will be needed in a few years than we needed during World War II. In another 25 years, we will probably need another 25 or 30 million tons of ore each year just for our own steel production. The international requirements for steel on steel products will continue to grow. By that time our United States open-pit direct-shipping ores will be furnishing a far smaller proportion, and a far smaller gross tonnage than today. Imports of foreign ores will be badly needed. Perhaps nearly half of the ore the steel industry will then use will have to be foreign ores.

Yet, it will still be in the vital national interest to have a dependable domestic source of iron ore—yes, a submarine-proof supply for the defense of our Nation. That ore will be produced only through an increase in taconite concentration capacity. In that 25 years it is reasonable to expect that the total United States taconite production might go as high as 40 million tons, with 30 million tons coming right out of the Minnesota Iron Range. By 1984 the iron range may not be producing as much total tonnage of iron ore as during the peak of wartime years, but there will be more men employed, and more families supported through the iron mining industry than ever before.

Research will make it possible well before that time, I firmly believe, to utilize our vast reserve of nonmagnetic taconite, as well as much of the tremendous peat resource we have here in northern Minnesota.

The new Bureau of Mines Minerals Research Laboratory, for which Congressman BLATNIK and I have fought for so many years, is at last becoming a reality. Last year we got the planning money, and this year we obtained the construction money, with the help of such good friends as the chairman of the Interior Committee of the Senate, Senator MURRAY, and Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Bureau of Mines scientists and other personnel are very grateful. They have been trying to get this laboratory since 1950, and indeed they even persuaded President Truman to request funds for the laboratory in the 1953 budget. That budget was revised by the Eisenhower administration, which struck out the request for the laboratory.

But, despite the opposition of the administration, we are going to have the laboratory. It is going to work on the large problems of nonmagnetic taconite. It is going to work on the development of our manganese resources. It is going to work on the better utilization of Minnesota peat.

I firmly believe that in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and the Iron Range Resources Commission that inside of 5 years this laboratory will make significant progress toward the utilization of these resources.

Research will be increasingly important, too, in the better utilization of the timber resources of northern, and particularly northeastern Minnesota. We managed to get a substantial increase this year, both in the facilities at the Lake States Forest Experiment Station down at Grand Rapids, and in the budget for the operation of the station. Generally we in the Senate increased the funds for forestry research throughout the country. All of this will pay off eventually in more income, more employment, more business in these forest areas of northern Minnesota.

Then, too, consider the impact on our economy of the St. Lawrence Seaway which will make Duluth, Minn., an ocean port. This means a stronger, a more prosperous Minnesota. With the deepening of the lake channels and improving the Duluth Harbor new constructive economic forces are being unleashed in Minnesota.

Taconite, of course, is not the whole answer on the Minnesota Iron Range, and we must have more than one string to our bow.

Taconite, however, does provide and increasingly will provide, a very stabilizing and steady influence in the northeastern Minnesota economy.

And we look to the years ahead, particularly as we consider the awesome problems surrounding our relationship with the Soviet Union, research and the development of the gifted individuals who spearhead research, and who can exploit a new idea to its utmost, must be a keystone in our national policy. We must by every means seek to make possible the full educational development of our naturally gifted young people. We must in every way seek to keep open the avenues of professional and economic opportunity, to keep our economy flexible, and expanding, to insure that new ideas in industry as well as in Government have an opportunity for expression and development. For it is ideas, and not things, that are truly crucially important. It is ideas that give impetus, a forward surge to the economic structure.

Before the machine must come the idea for the machine. Before the process must come the idea for the process. Before the great financial investment must come the willingness to dare, to bet on something that is not a sure thing—the way Reserve Mining Co. and its associates, Erie Mining and its associates, and indeed, the people of Minnesota through their elected representatives were willing to bet.

In some ways, the state of the world today is one great, tremendous problem and difficulty. It is so complicated and so difficult that men of small courage are tempted to turn away from it and to try to forget it. In a sense, the problems of the world are like this great billion-and-a-half-ton mass of taconite that we are all standing on and on which this taconite works is built.

A few years ago, this bed of rock was an almost indigestible mass—so large and so tough that most people despaired of its ever being reduced to a usable resource. But it has been solved. It has been fragmented. It is being reduced to a valuable and manageable resource.

And the great problems of world poverty, illness and fear, and of major war can also be solved. If ever a demonstration was needed that nearly any problem can be

solved, given sufficient intelligence and tenacity and courage and cooperation, the saga of taconite has demonstrated it.

The iron range economic problem can be solved.

This peculiar, spotty, and erratic recession that grips the country today can be solved.

The aching problems of poverty and illness which plague not only most of the world, but great sections of our own people, can be solved.

Peace and its blessings are obtainable—despite the black picture of the arms race, international distrust, racial and religious and political hatred that grips the world today.

I do not think that these problems are going to be solved all at once. I do not expect any millennium to come 5 years, 10 years, or even a generation from now. But if we have the dedication and the devotion and the intelligence necessary, we can break down these problems into manageable units. We can refuse to be awed by the tremendous, overwhelming size of all the problems put together. We can roll up our sleeves and go to work, just as this wonderful community of scholars and scientists and political leaders and engineers and investors have done here on the Minnesota Iron Range.

Here has been demonstrated the ability of a free society, a flexible, enterprising, and courageous society, to deal with major problems. In a sense, this taconite development has been a kind of "test tube" experiment. As vast as the sums of money involved have been, as huge as these new industrial complexes may be, they are truly infinitesimal by comparison with the staggering costs and the towering political and social problems of fashioning a new kind of world—reasonably free from want and fear and pain.

Yes; this experiment in research and engineering, government, and economics has a real application for the larger problems facing us all. Let us hope that the lessons learned here in Minnesota can be more broadly applied, and that this highly successful experiment in planning and living can serve as a pilot operation for undertakings of even broader scope and significance here and abroad.

We will surely need a lot more of the kind of joining of brains and courage that went into the creation of this great industry, if our American economy is going to expand sufficiently to meet the massive Soviet challenge.

Let us hope that we as a nation will have the maturity to reassume the political and economic initiative we have so largely lost during the past few years.

We can regain the initiative, and we can regain our position of leadership. We can build a new kind of world relationship—based on the United Nations—a relationship for peaceful pursuits rather than an alliance for destruction.

For despite the continued and implacable Soviet hostility to our way of life, the Soviet leaders and ourselves eventually must face up to the fact that the only alternative to competitive coexistence is no existence. There is no future in blowing each other up. And so long as we can match their military capabilities, they are going to have no other choice but to compete with us in nonviolent ways—economically, politically. We should welcome this opportunity to compete in this way. This is our meat and drink, if we could only see it.

We are builders, essentially. We grow things. We make things. We Americans are basically constructive, by our very nature. This plant and this town of Babbitt are clear proof of that idea.

Let us, then, be true to our nature. Let us be constructive. Let us seek to build new markets abroad for our industry. Let us seek to provide markets here for new industry abroad. Let us strengthen the bonds of trade; let us expand our program

of technical assistance to the have-not peoples. We should be sending our engineers and technicians out on a far broader scale—showing these peoples how to help themselves.

It is not, after all, a question of sharing our wealth with the rest of the world, but of creating new wealth—of sharing potential wealth. There are vast new pools of wealth in the future—nuclear power, new propulsion chemicals, cheap electricity, cheap heating, new metals and plastics, new foods.

Certainly a world in which relative wealth is common is a dream today. So was taconite a dream a generation ago. One has become, the other can become a reality.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in the morning press a story, both in the Washington Post and Times Herald and in the New York Times, concerning the action of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting the farm bill. The news story indicated that the action of the committee in reporting the bill was unanimous. The headline for the story is "Senate Unit Asks Low Farm Props."

The subheadline is "Committee Votes Measure on Crop Freedom—Benson Denounces House's Bill."

Under a dateline of June 24, Washington, UPI dispatch, the story reads in part, as follows:

The Senate Agriculture Committee unanimously approved a pared-down farm bill today granting the administration's requests for lower price supports and more planting freedom for farmers.

Mr. President, I shall not read the remainder of the news story because the first paragraph indicates how wrong the story really is.

The junior Senator from Minnesota opposes the farm bill. The junior Senator from Minnesota stated in committee that he opposed the bill. There was not a rollcall on the question of reporting the bill, merely because the bill had yet to be properly phrased in the technical language which is required in the case of legislation before the Senate.

That bill represents a lowering of farm income, in my view. I offered two amendments to the bill. The first related to feed grains, and would have given a modicum of justice to the producers of feed grains. The second amendment related to milk and dairy products. It would have provided \$3.25 a hundredweight for milk.

Those two amendments were defeated by a very narrow margin, I regret to say. Nevertheless, attempts were made to afford some semblance of economic justice in a piece of proposed legislation.

I want the record to be clear. I have no intention, as a Member of the Senate or as a private citizen of doing or saying anything which would result in the reduction of farm income.

So far as the farm bill affects the farmers in the section of the country which I am privileged to represent, it would not help income. It would further lower farm income.

I repeat what I said on the floor earlier. When the administration acted to lower price supports on dairy products, and particularly on milk and but-

terfat, it did not provide any relief for consumers. It did not save the consumers any money. All it did was to deny to good producers a fair income and a reasonable profit.

The facts are manifestly clear. The action of the Department of Agriculture in lowering dairy farm price supports, which action was subscribed to by the President of the United States, has resulted in many millions of dollars of lost income, and no saving to the consumer.

Further, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in 1954, when the administration lowered price supports on milk and milk products, the junior Senator from Minnesota pointed out that the result would be a scandal. I stood on the floor of the Senate and said that what would happen would be that the producers of manufactured milk products, such as cheese, would sell their products to the Government at the high parity, prior to the time that the low parity was to go into effect, and then would buy them back at the low figure, thereby giving them a bonanza which would be unconscionable.

That very thing happened. Only last week a Federal circuit court held those producers and processors guilty of violating the law.

I say that there was a plain invitation to law violation which was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. Make no mistake about it. The junior Senator from Minnesota does not approve the bill. I think I can speak for the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], who serves on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He told me this morning his views on this question, and brought to my attention the news story to which I have referred.

The truth is that neither the junior Senator from Wisconsin nor the junior Senator from Minnesota approves the bill; and unless the bill is drastically modified so as to give protection and some assistance to the overall needs of agriculture, I shall vote against it. I shall not only vote against it, but I shall fight against it.

It is my intention to offer amendments to the farm bill on the floor of the Senate, seeking a semblance of justice for producers in the great Midwest.

In the areas which the bill seeks to touch, in the areas of cotton and rice, in particular, I believe the committee bill is an advance; but I must say most sincerely that we have trouble producing cotton and rice in my part of the country. I feel that an agricultural bill ought to meet the needs of the total agricultural economy, and not merely a part of it.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIER. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his statement. I agree with him 100 percent.

I also wish to testify to the fact that the article appearing in the New York Times, under the UPI dateline, is wrong. No vote was taken on the bill in committee. If there had been a vote I would have voted against reporting the bill. I think the bill is unconscionable. I think it is most unfortunate that no action was taken for the relief of farmers. The action taken in committee will hurt dairy farmers indirectly.

Furthermore, I supported the amendments of the Senator from Minnesota. I thought those amendments were good. I am delighted to hear that the Senator intends to propose such amendments on the floor of the Senate. I will enthusiastically support him.

I also discussed an amendment in the committee, and put the committee on notice that I intended to offer my amendment on the floor of the Senate.

The fact is that the dairy farmers throughout America are suffering. They have not enjoyed any of the price increases which other farmers have enjoyed. They are in serious trouble. Their costs have increased. I think they are the No. 1 victims of economic injustice.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without subscribing to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

The farm bill was discussed in committee. It has not yet been reported. It is a most unfortunate bill, and I shall do everything I can to correct it. If it is not corrected, I shall oppose it and vote against it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

NEED FOR ELIMINATION OF THREAT OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has been very considerate, and I wish to thank him. If he will yield briefly for a further statement, I have a statement to make relating to an action which took place in the Senate on Monday. I refer to the action of the Senate in passing the so-called atomic energy bill, House bill 12716. It had been my understanding that no vote was to be taken on the atomic energy bill at least before Tuesday, and I expected to participate in the debate on that particular measure.

Other commitments kept me away from the floor of the Senate at the time the debate was under way on that bill.

I wish to pay particular tribute to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his masterful handling and presentation of the bill, and also to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], both for his statesmanlike and thoughtful presentation relating to the proposed legislation, and for the questions he raised—questions which go to the heart of the entire problem of the distribution of atomic energy know-how. The whole Nation owes the Senator from New Mexico a debt of gratitude. I hope the warning

signs he raised during the debate and discussion on the floor of the Senate when the bill was under consideration will be heeded by the Atomic Energy Commission and the executive branch of the Government.

I am sure that my colleagues know of my special interest in this area because of my role as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament. In that capacity I fully understand the doubts and fears which have been expressed by many groups in this country over the possible ramifications of a wider sharing of atomic weapons or special nuclear material.

Mr. President, our consideration of the bill (S. 3912), which is the Senate version of House bill 12716, to furnish nuclear weapons information and atomic material to our allies, comes at a critical point in our foreign policy. It comes at a time when we stand at a fateful crossroads in our national security. One choice before us is a greater reliance upon modern weapons of mass destruction. This alternative would logically require the spread of a nuclear military capability to our allies in order to strengthen our combined defense against armed aggression.

The other choice is an attempt to reduce the threat of a devastating war by international agreement to curb weapons of mass destruction. This alternative requires that limits be placed upon existing capabilities for waging nuclear war and that the spread of nuclear arms "know-how" to additional countries be prevented.

We face this apparently contradictory choice at a moment when representatives of the United States are preparing to engage in international negotiations on a technical level regarding an inspection system for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests. These approaching parleys are of great significance because they could be the breach in the wall that has long blocked successful conclusion of a first step disarmament agreement. Twelve years of diplomatic negotiation on the difficult problem of disarmament are now coming to an apex at this impending conference. Effective inspection, the main topic of this conference, is the key problem that has created a logjam in the disarmament proceedings. If we can blast out this obstacle, then progress toward a relaxation in international tension might be made.

One of the most fearful results of the failure of the great powers to agree on a method of limiting the threat of the use of atomic weapons is that now that threat is becoming compounded by the spread of nuclear "know-how" to other countries. We often call this problem the "fourth country problem," because three powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—already have atomic arms. If we do not solve the "fourth country problem," then it will soon become a "fifth country problem," and so on. For this reason, I shall refer to this problem as the "nth country problem." Once more than a handful of nations acquire the secrets of atomic technology and manufacture, we shall

really be in grave trouble. This will be so unless we find a way to prevent atomic weapons development and production. One way to do this is through an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests with inspection and, second, to prohibit the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes with inspection. Both of these points are set forth as policy statements on the part of the Government of the United States.

If we think we are in peril now, with nuclear arms in the hands of only three powers, then the peril to our survival will be precarious indeed once multiple countries can annihilate each other. Relatively speaking, the present situation is manageable and tolerable compared with the uncertain and out-of-control conditions that would result from a broad distribution of nuclear weapons.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament unanimously warned in a report last September that:

As nuclear weapons are spread throughout the world the likelihood of their use in war increases.

The subcommittee pointed out that under current international conditions national security depends upon mutual deterrence, that is, an aggressive nuclear power is deterred from launching an atomic attack by the knowledge that it will receive in return a devastating nuclear retaliation. Security based on such a principle, the subcommittee warned, rests on a shaky foundation, because the number of nuclear nations will undoubtedly grow.

The idea of nuclear deterrence implies a degree of rationality—

Our report said—

It assumes that the leaders of a government realize that their own country cannot escape the catastrophe of nuclear war and that, consequently, they strive to prevent it from occurring. If nuclear weapons are possessed by many countries with different types of governments, the element of rationality would be reduced. In some cases, there might be the temptation to use such weapons without due concern for the consequences.

The dangers of the *n*th country problem have also been graphically pointed out by others. I would like to call your attention, Mr. President, to a recent report by a special committee of the National Planning Association, entitled, "1970 Without Arms Control." It is a competent and revealing survey of modern weaponry and what it could become in another decade. This report cautions that the possession of even a small number of nuclear weapons, compact in size and capable of destroying whole ports, airfields, manufacturing plants, or cities, would place tremendous power in the hands of a small nation. Under irresponsible control, they could be used for blackmail. They could also catalyze wars which inevitably would involve larger powers. It requires little imagination to visualize how a little Hitler in some turbulent region could by accident or design literally set the world on fire.

There are various methods by which the technical ability to make nuclear weapons can spread to other countries. The two principal ones are first, develop-

ment of such a capability from domestic resources without outside aid, and second, through direct transfer of knowledge and of means from one country to another. It is only a matter of time before certain countries will begin producing atomic arms out of their own resources. France, of course, will likely be first. Within a few years Canada, Sweden, Germany, Communist China, and Czechoslovakia might be numbered in the ranks of the nuclear powers.

Modern technology races forward in such leaps and bounds that in two decades there might be 10, a dozen, or even more countries with a nuclear weapon capability, just by relying on their own resources. If those governments now possessing nuclear knowledge and materials should by deliberate policy, transfer such knowledge to other nations and help them to get started on an atomic arsenal, then the whole process would be greatly speeded up. It is quite conceivable that, if nuclear know-how were freely communicated, half the countries of the world might possess tremendously destructive armaments by 1975. The threat that might then exist to human survival from even the smallest accidental fight that might break out between two small countries could be incalculable.

With these thoughts in mind I have attempted to evaluate the proposed legislation.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is to be highly commended for its statesmanlike handling of this bill. It has skillfully combined and reconciled the two alternative choices I alluded to at the beginning of my remarks.

On the one hand it has appreciably strengthened our defense alliances by providing for technological cooperation in modern arms. But at the same time it has carefully sought to avoid aggravation of the *n*th country problem.

The bill permits the executive branch to furnish classified information regarding methods of manufacturing atomic weapons and fissionable materials used in the fabrication of atomic weapons only to countries that have already made a good and substantial progress on an atomic capability through their own initiative. Great Britain is the only one of our allies that now meets this qualification. Thus, under this law the President will be empowered to give a country the information and the nuclear materials for making atomic weapons only if the country is already an atomic country and only if the information transferred is necessary to improve the country's design, development or fabrication capability. These are provisos that will operate to prevent aggravation of the *n*th country problem.

At this point I should like to state a reservation regarding this bill. As I have said, the bill authorizes the transfer of information and material for the nuclear portions of bombs and warheads only if the recipient country has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons. The phrase "substantial progress," as was brought out by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HEN-

NINGS) is nowhere defined in the bill and it is one of those phrases that could permit considerable latitude of interpretation. The Joint Committee defines it rather fully in its report. It says that this phrase means that the recipient nation "must have achieved considerably more than a mere theoretical knowledge of atomic-weapons design, or the testing of a limited number of atomic weapons." The committee spells this out further to mean that the recipient nation "must have achieved a capability on its own of fabricating a variety of atomic weapons, and constructed and operated the necessary facilities, including weapons research and development laboratories, weapon manufacturing facilities, a weapon-testing station, and trained personnel to operate each of these facilities."

My regret is that these requirements or something like them were not included in the language of the bill.

I note, however, that in regard to its interpretation of the phrase in question the Joint Committee intends to have full information from the executive regarding any determinations it will make. I trust that this information will be forthcoming from the executive; and if it should not, or if the executive should attempt to interpret the legislation in a manner substantially different from the understanding of the Joint Committee, then this legislation should be reexamined.

Insofar as the *n*th country problem will naturally evolve from the normal expansion of scientific knowledge and of productive capabilities, the wise and proper way of tackling it is by international agreement. An international agreement for a suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons would with virtual certainty prevent any signatory country that did not now have an atomic military capability from acquiring one through its own efforts. This is why it is imperative that the administration should vigorously pursue a policy directed at achievement of an agreement of this kind with the Soviet Union and other nations of the world.

Much has been said about the importance of an agreement with the Soviet Union on the question of banning tests of nuclear weapons with the safeguard of effective inspection and detection. However, the agreement must go further. The agreement must not merely be between the United States and the Soviet Union; it must be under the auspices of the United Nations, so that the provisions of such an agreement will apply to other nations. Otherwise, we shall see the development and the expansion of the technological know-how of atomic nuclear weapons among many other countries. We shall be fooling ourselves into believing that a limitation of tests between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America will provide a slowdown of the armaments race. What it will merely do will be to provide a slowdown on the part of the two major powers, but may well aggravate and intensify development in other countries.

Such an agreement could hopefully be promoted by certain provisions of this

bill. Some of our allies, particularly in NATO, who do not possess a nuclear capability of their own have been reluctant to give up the right to hold nuclear tests lest they forever abandon the possibility of becoming nuclear military powers in their own right.

Under this bill, specified information about nuclear weapons and certain components of such weapons can be transferred to our allies so that they can be sure their military forces will be able to join in cooperative nuclear defense against an armed aggression, if it should ever be necessary. Under present law, the United States can already give our allies certain information about atomic weapons. With this information, military commanders can train their forces in the use of such weapons, mutual-defense plans can be developed, and the mutual-weapons capabilities of potential enemies can be evaluated. Under present law, nuclear weapons themselves cannot be given to another country, and transfer of design and fabrication data regarding these weapons is strictly limited.

There are some differences between the bills acted upon by the Senate and the House which will have to be ironed out.

The Senate bill would permit the United States to give additional information on atomic arms to allies and also to furnish them with certain nuclear materials. Great Britain is the only country under this bill which we could now tell how to make nuclear arms and actually give nuclear material for use in such arms. But under this bill we could give our other partners in NATO, or our allies elsewhere, sufficient data on nuclear bombs and warheads so that they could manufacture compatible delivery systems, such as aircraft and rockets. Another innovation is that we could give them nonnuclear parts of nuclear weapons, such as bomb casings. However, we still could not transfer to them entire nuclear weapons or nuclear parts of such weapons.

Nuclear parts would remain in United States custody. This bill would also permit the transfer of certain military type nuclear reactors, such as those employed in atomic-powered submarines, to our allies and nuclear materials for use in these reactors.

This matter, also, was the subject of heated and extended discussion in the Senate. I believe the points raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] are convincing and valid and that his admonitions should be carefully noted.

There is, however, a possible peril in this particular part of the legislation that has disturbed me considerably. Specifically, it concerns the provision for transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons.

Again, the Senator from New Mexico carefully stated his case concerning this subject.

Statements have been made by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission and by others that the transfer of nonnuclear parts of these

fissionable weapons would impart knowledge that would facilitate fabrication of the nuclear part, thus resulting in a complete weapon. Admiral Strauss has written that in those cases where weapons without "nuclear components" are transferred to another power, that power could duplicate these weapons even though it had no prior nuclear weapons capability." If transfer of non-nuclear components to other countries would substantially assist them in acquiring a nuclear arms manufacturing capability of their own, then I would consider this a serious deficiency in the bill. This of course is a technological question that is surrounded by much secrecy, so to a great extent reliance must be placed on the judgment of the Joint Committee which has specifically been created by Congress to keep informed on this special field and to advise it on appropriate action. I know that the Joint Committee has carefully considered this point in the bill and I note that in its report approving the bill it makes a solemn statement affirming "the intent not to encourage additional nations to achieve nuclear weapons capability." I accept that statement in good faith. If members of the Joint Committee could at the present time add further clarification on this point, I would be very grateful. In any case, it is my general intention to be alert to any developments indicating whether those countries which will receive information and materials under this legislation are being assisted in a significant way to establish their own nuclear arms capability by the bill as it passed the Senate.

Under the cooperative nuclear defense arrangements of this bill an allied country can have many of the military benefits of a nuclear capability in its armed forces without actually undertaking the heavy financial burden of establishing its own nuclear arms industry. Thus, the cause of eventual nuclear disarmament can be promoted by removing reasons that might exist for separate and independent nuclear manufacturing efforts. There should be no reason why any of our allies which participated in the transfers of knowledge and materials authorized by this bill should be opposed to being a party to an international agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests.

When the administration first sent this bill up to the Hill it was characterized by an astounding blindness to the necessities of a consistent disarmament policy. The lack of coordination between legitimate defense and effective foreign policy was alarming. It was evident that one department of the administration had only a dim concept of what another was doing. Now, however, as a result of the Joint Committee's labors, we have, subject to the reservations I have voiced, a coordinated instrument of legislation that can balance the practical demands of our defense and disarmament policies. By this bill we have demonstrated to world opinion that while we are preparing ourselves adequately for any test by an aggressor, we

are above all a nation dedicated to peace. It demonstrates that, if necessary, we are determined to wield our arms courageously but that we are willing to bury them forever if others will but grasp our outstretched hand. After carefully weighing the advantages and risks, I came to the conclusion that the revisions of the bill by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee are worthy of support, subject, of course, to the reservations I have made. Under present circumstances it could make a net contribution to disarmament and peace.

Mr. President, in line with the reservations which I expressed in this statement I am pleased to note that the Senate adopted two amendments offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], first, respecting transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons or special nuclear material, and second, to eliminate language respecting cooperation with another nation as to other military applications of atomic energy with the exception of certain restricted data.

These amendments were consistent with my own approach to the bill and I heartily endorse them. I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight and leadership.

Mr. President, I am sure that many people continue to have serious reservations about this legislation.

I have received many telegrams and messages in opposition to it, and raising points of grave concern.

I myself support H. R. 12716 as amended. On balance I think the bill and the accompanying legislative history provide sufficient safeguards to make this legislation a risk worth taking. We can never deliberate with assurance on these matters, but I do believe that the legislative history of this proposal as it has proceeded through the Joint Committee and floor debate is one more example of the emergence of a bill refined and improved by the legislative process.

I compliment the members of the Joint Committee and in particular Senator Pastore on the their serious and effective attention to this historic proposal. I hope that the Senate changes in the bill will be preserved in the conference.

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the editorials of Mr. David Lawrence, printed in U. S. News & World Report, are always up to a high standard of excellence. The editorial in the June 27 issue is no exception. The burden of this editorial is that the world Communist conspiracy can no more change its evil character than the leopard can change his spots.

As Mr. Lawrence says:

The Communist movement is not just a political belief, as some of our cloistered Supreme Court Justices naively have declared.

Because I am sure many of my colleagues will enjoy reading this editorial, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of the my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEOPARD UNCHANGED

(By David Lawrence)

The men in the Kremlin have once more shown their perfidy.

The solemn promise that no harm would come to former Premier Imre Nagy of Hungary if he left the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest, in which he had taken refuge in 1956, has been violated.

It is another example of wanton disregard of the pledged word.

President Eisenhower rightly says the episode is a serious obstacle to further consideration of a summit conference. For of what avail can it be to make an agreement with a government which repeatedly gives conspicuous evidence that it will not abide by its agreements?

Certainly there is no reason to believe now that a mere meeting of the heads of the four governments would be conducive to the making of a stable peace. Indeed, the idea of a summit conference, which the Soviet Union has urged so persistently, has been revealed as a transparent piece of propaganda. It has emerged as a stratagem without an honest purpose.

For it has been demonstrated again to the western nations that the Soviet rulers, while professing to be peaceful, are not true to their own words. They have sought, for instance, to give the impression that the smaller countries contiguous to them—the captive nations—are really independent and may rule as they please. But this hoax is now fully exposed.

The story of the tragedy of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 was graphically told to the peoples of the Free World, but nevertheless there have since arisen in our midst apologists who say that agreements with the Soviet Government still can be made—as, for example, to suspend nuclear tests. It is insisted that we should take the risk of weakening our military strength. If the Communists disregard their pledges, it is recklessly asserted, we can detect such action and resume testing. But in the meantime, of course, we lose the benefit of the time and knowledge we would have gained had we continued our tests. Even some prominent members of the Democratic Party in Congress have fallen victim to the illusion that a Soviet pledge to suspend nuclear tests can be accepted as valid.

The controversy over nuclear tests has been kept going artificially by the Communists. They have enlisted on their side a lot of misguided pacifists and wishful thinkers who believe that since Stalin's days there have been marked changes for the better in the attitude of the Communist Party and of the Kremlin.

But now suddenly we see Stalinism boldly exhibited in all its brutality. What will it take to convince our defeatists that the Soviet rulers really cannot be trusted and that we cannot accept assurances from any government in Moscow unless it is chosen in free elections by an emancipated people?

Must we endure the painful penalties of self-deception that are bound to follow if we yield to the argument of some of the intellectuals of the West who say that communism is "here to stay" and that we "must find a way to live with it"?

Surely free men will not be so lacking in the courage of their convictions that they will accept tyranny as commonplace and despotism as inevitable.

Rather the history of free men teaches us that they prefer the risk of death to life under slavery. They have heroically exercised their right of revolution in the past. They will do so again.

Today even the neutralist world, as typified by India's Nehru, expresses a sense of shock

over the disclosures that four leaders in the Hungarian revolution have been executed after a secret trial.

The irony of the affair is that Moscow has been portraying Hungary as an independent nation and now pretends that the revolution's leaders were punished by the local government in Budapest. The world, however, is convinced that Moscow ordered the executions and that, in the captive countries, Moscow's word is law. Both Houses of our Congress unanimously adopted last week a resolution expressing America's deep sense of indignation over the Soviet murder of Premier Nagy and his associates.

With characteristic arrogance, the tyrants of the Soviet Union have publicized the execution of the four Hungarian leaders as a lesson for all those who are planning plots against the people. The threat to all the captive countries in Eastern Europe is clear.

Communist imperialism still defiantly waves its bloodstained hands before the world. There must be no letup in our resistance, through the cold war, to the Soviet schemes. For the Communists are engaged in a desperate game of deception. They are actively trying to infiltrate and subvert the free governments of the world. The Communist movement is not just a political belief, as some of our cloistered Supreme Court Justices naively have declared. The Communist conspiracy is international. It is a military menace.

The Communist leopard showed conclusively last week that it cannot change its spots.

SOUTH AMERICAN TOUR OF THE NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is most gratifying to note the enthusiastic reception which has been extended to the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra during their South American tour. In contrast to the recent less fortunate incidents, this news serves to reemphasize the value of cultural exchange in our international relations. It is to be hoped that this encouraging sign will serve as a reminder to us all that there are faithful and constructive things that can be done in the field of cultural exchange to buttress the objectives of United States foreign policy.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Latins Hail Philharmonic," from the Minneapolis Star for June 6, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATINS HAIL PHILHARMONIC

Something has been happening regularly for 5 weeks that proves many South Americans like us North Americans and even admire explosively some aspects of our culture. It is something that should underscore for all of us the importance of the cultural front in our foreign relations. We refer to the fantastically successful tour of the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra.

In the capital cities of Venezuela and Peru, where Vice President Nixon was exposed to one kind of mob, the Philharmonic also was mobbed—by enthusiastic fans reluctant to call it an evening. In Lima, the crowd did its best to atone for the attack on Nixon, and "The Star Spangled Banner" got the biggest ovation. In Chile, cheering crowds followed conductor Bernstein in the streets.

Major causes of United States difficulties in the Americas are political and economic. But once anti-United States sentiment is aroused it embraces all aspects of our behavior.

"The old catchwords about the intellectual crudeness of North Americans, their cultural shortcomings and their boorishness are treasured as novel thoughts," writes Tad Szulc in the New York Times.

The Philharmonic's tour has discredited many of those catchwords.

EXECUTION OF IMRE NAGY AND ASSOCIATES IN HUNGARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is gratifying to note that the deplorable execution of Hungary's Nagy is not being received with acquiescence and apathy in countries who have had association with the Communist bloc. I call the attention of the Senate to the New York Times article of June 23 concerning the vigorous protest of the Yugoslavian Government against the violation of an honorable agreement and the subsequent cruel treatment and ultimate murder of Nagy.

Clearly, the Yugoslav people are incensed over the trial by terror in Hungary. To this degree the tragedy of Nagy may serve a useful purpose in clarifying Soviet intentions in Eastern Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELGRADE ASSAILS BUDAPEST FRAUD—PROTEST ON NAGY CALLS CHARGE YUGOSLAV EMBASSY AIDED HIM A PURE FABRICATION

(By Elie Abel)

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia, June 23.—The Yugoslav Government registered a vigorous protest today against the secret trial and execution of Imre Nagy and his associates.

In a note delivered this morning by Jovo Kopicic, Yugoslav Ambassador in Budapest, President Tito's government suggested bluntly that the entire indictment against Mr. Nagy, Gen. Pal Malter, military leader in the uprising, and two others smacked of fraud.

Belgrade rejected as "fabricated from the beginning to the end," the Hungarian Justice Ministry's accusation that Mr. Nagy, Hungary's Premier during the 1956 uprising, had directed a last-ditch campaign of resistance to the new regime installed by the Soviet Army while he was in asylum at the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest.

In light of this patently false allegation and the fact that the trial was secret, there is good reason to doubt the "truthfulness of the rest of the indictment," the Yugoslav note said.

DIPLOMATS SURPRISED AT TONE

The protest note, drafted last weekend at a meeting of the highest Yugoslav leaders with President Tito on Brioni Island, surprised some diplomats here by the sharpness of its tone.

Not a line of note was calculated to spare the feelings of the Hungarian regime or its Soviet sponsors. The language indicated that the Yugoslav leadership realized it was in for a long and bitter struggle, one that would not be sweetened by synthetic politeness.

Belgrade said the Hungarian Government had twice violated its guaranty of safe conduct to Mr. Nagy and his associates. The first time was November 22, 1956, when they

were kidnaped on emerging from the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest and sent into forced exile in Rumania, the note said. The second breach of the agreement was Mr. Nagy's execution, Belgrade charged.

The whole business was staged "to aggravate and justify" the current Soviet bloc campaign against Marshal Tito, the Yugoslav note commented.

It termed the Hungarian Government's action "a crude and completely unprovoked attack" that dealt "a heavy blow to relations between the two countries."

SOVIET PRODDING SUGGESTED

Without too much subtlety, the Yugoslav note implied that the Hungarian Government had joined the attack on Soviet orders rather than of its own free will.

Even in that event, however, Budapest deserved condemnation because relations between Hungary and Yugoslavia have been improving after a long period of estrangement and this progress now has been set back, the note went on.

Belgrade added a reminder that in 1949 Laszlo Rajk, another Hungarian Communist, had been tried and put to death in an effort to prove that Yugoslavia was guilty of interference in Hungarian affairs. Only after "much innocent blood" had been shed was the Hungarian Government forced to admit that the proofs against Mr. Rajk were fabricated, the note said.

Finally Belgrade reminded the Hungarian Government that Mr. Nagy was not in a position to carry any kind of political activities from the Yugoslav Embassy because the building off Heroes Square in Budapest, was "under strict supervision of Soviet Army units and the Hungarian security police" throughout his period of asylum.

The note mentioned that a Yugoslav diplomat had been shot dead inside the embassy by fire from Soviet tanks in the streets.

"The Yugoslav Government and our peoples have received this sudden news about the secret trial and execution of Imre Nagy with deep bitterness," the note said.

HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 1497, the companion to the House-passed bill providing for the humane slaughter of animals, I was particularly pleased to note the June 22 Washington Post editorial entitled "Temporizing With Cruelty. There is no need for further study of humane-slaughter techniques. They are based on the simple assumption that an animal should be rendered unconscious before it is killed. I doubt very much that we are presently at a loss for effective scientific methods of accomplishing this end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORIZING WITH CRUELTY

It is a real misfortune that the Senate Agriculture Committee, yielding to the pressure of a number of big meatpackers, reported on Wednesday a cynical bill calling for a 2-year study of humane methods of slaughter in American packinghouses. The committee had before it a moderate practical measure, a companion to the Poage bill passed by the House of Representatives, which would have precluded United States Government purchases of products from slaughterhouses employing inhumane techniques. The bill thoroughly deserved the Agriculture Committee's approval. We hope

it will be substituted for the dilatory and evasive measure reported by the committee when that issue comes to the floor.

There is no need whatever for a 2-year study of humane-slaughter techniques. They have been studied and perfected by universities; they have been tested in operation by a number of progressive meatpackers; they have long been in use—and required by law—in civilized European countries. They are based on the simple principle that an animal ought to be rendered unconscious before it is killed—instead of being put to death by the sadistic methods still widely used in the United States. Abandonment by unnecessary cruelty to animals in this enlightened land is long overdue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution I have recently received from the Pittsburgh annual conference of the Methodist Church concerning humane slaughter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SLAUGHTER OF MEAT ANIMALS, THE PITTSBURGH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

Whereas various bills on the subject of humane slaughter of meat animals have been introduced in the Congress of the United States dealing with several phases of this question and representing different points of view, some of which have been presented in the interest of those friendly to the packers and recommending delay and nonaction; and

Whereas Senate bill 1497 has been introduced and sponsored by Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, Democrats; and WILLIAM A. PURTELL, of Connecticut, Republican, making humane methods mandatory but granting a 2-year delay to give the packing plants plenty of time to convert, with House bill 8308 also having been presented as compromise and having been adopted by the House on February 4, 1958; and

Whereas those numbered as favorable to humane slaughter of meat animals are the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in its editorials, the Congregational Churches of Connecticut, the National Farmers Union, various units of the Association of Business and Professional Women, the Catholic War Veterans, the American Legion and other groups, the two big packinghouse workers' unions, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, and, very significantly, the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and several companies have introduced humane methods of slaughtering; and

Whereas at the hearing before the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee this year and the Senate committee last year not one Christian religious organization as such was on hand to plead for passage of these bills: therefore be it

Resolved by the Pittsburgh Annual Conference of the Methodist Church:

First. We oppose a widespread situation in this country where millions of meat animals for American tables are slaughtered every year under conditions of unthinkable brutality.

Second. We strongly urge increasing use of humane slaughtering methods which have long been in use in Britain, Holland, Switzerland, in all the Scandinavian countries, and also in New Zealand and the Fiji Islands, and we commend the several American packing plants which have employed such methods, the use of anesthetics, a captive-bolt pistol.

Third. We protest the delay in dealing with such a situation and call upon the Congress

to enact at once the legislation necessary to correct the present situation and to insure humane slaughtering methods in the packing plants of the United States. Such bills as Senate bill 1497 and House bill 8308 are samples of the legislation required.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico under the same conditions as I have heretofore yielded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3910) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 25, 1958, pp. 12244-12252, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me, in order that I may make a statement on the conference report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not have the floor, so I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico was yielded to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yielded on the condition that it would not count as a speech by me on the Alaskan statehood bill and on the further condition that I would not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from South Dakota proceeds, I wonder whether it will be desirable to have a quorum call, in order to have a full attendance of Senators to consider the conference report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know of no question or controversy on the report.

The conferees met on yesterday and, after a full and free discussion of the different points at issue, every member of the conference committee, both the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House, signed the report.

I take the floor at this time to make that statement, first.

In the second place, I wish to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the conference committee for the effective

way in which they presented the point of view of the Senate.

Third, Mr. President, I take the floor because I wish to call attention to the achievement of an agreement on the so-called power-reservation clause with reference to the Missouri River Basin authorization.

The House had included a proviso to the reservation clause. The reservation appeared in both the House version and in the Senate version of the bill. The proviso was subject to at least dual interpretations. Under the interpretation which I obtained informally from the officials in the Department of the Interior, it would have, or could have negated the power reservation.

The House proviso read as follows:

Provided, That the distribution of such power shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

It was believed by those with whom I conferred that that would not merely insure preference for the preference customers within the State where a dam was located, but it would also prevent any distribution of reserved power to any other than preference customers. Consequently, I proposed the language which was adopted by the conferees. That language is as follows:

Provided, That the distribution and sale of such reserved power within the State shall be made first to preference users in keeping with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944; *And provided further*, That the power so reserved for use within the State shall be not to exceed 50 percent of the output of such dam.

I have literally and verbatim read the words of the proviso as they appear in the conference report.

I call attention to the fact that by using the words "shall be made first to preference users in keeping with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944," the proviso does not prevent the sale and distribution to other than preference users of the reserved power which the preference customers within the State might not themselves need.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 provides, first, that the power which is excess to the needs of the Corps of Engineers shall be turned over to the Secretary of the Interior, and he shall dispose of it in such fashion as to accomplish the most widespread use at the lowest rates consistent with good business principles. That of itself does not forbid the sale to customers other than preference customers.

The second portion of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires that preference be given to rural cooperatives, municipalities, and other public agencies. But it will be seen that, taken together, there is no prohibition of the sale to customers other than preference customers if the purpose of widespread distribution and lowest rates consistent with sound business principles and approval by the Federal Power Commission is complied with.

It was to preserve the possible sale to other than preference customers, out of

the reserved power, that the first part of this proviso was proposed.

The second part of the proviso was developed and proposed in the conference committee in order to avoid any possible misconception or trouble over interpretation as to what a reasonable amount might be. The total amount of power which can be generated by the great dams on the Missouri River in South Dakota will be somewhat more than 1 billion kilowatts. The amount which will be produced will probably be in excess of 1,100,000,000 kilowatts. The Big Bend Dam—the one dam which is yet to be constructed, and which will come within the terms of the reservation—will produce, so it is estimated, slightly more than 200,000 kilowatts.

By means of the language of the second proviso, we seek to make clear just what a reasonable amount would be.

The proviso reads:

And provided further, That the power so reserved for use within the State shall be not to exceed 50 percent of the output of such dam.

In other words, in round figures, a reasonable amount would be identified as roughly 100,000 kilowatts or whatever above that might be the odd amount of the total production.

I make this statement definitely, Mr. President, as the author of the proviso and as a member of the conference committee, because I do not want the proviso to be misunderstood, nor do I want any problem of interpretation to arise in the future.

In the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I notice that they have paraphrased the proviso as follows:

Provided, That the power so reserved for use within the State not exceed 50 percent of the output of the dam.

But, Mr. President, I feel that that is not quite an accurate paraphrase; and the interpretation must be that which is provided by the conference report itself, namely:

Provided further, That the power so reserved for use within the State shall be not to exceed 50 percent of the output of such dam.

That is different, in this respect: It is an affirmative earmarking or directive of 50 percent, and not a mere negative limitation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to ask several questions of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota about this reservation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon speak louder, so all of us can hear him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes, Mr. President.

I will say that I wish to ask several questions of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota about this power reservation, as it finally has emerged from the conference committee.

I ask the questions for a reason which is very pertinent to those of us who come

from the Pacific Northwest. There has been a great deal of controversy—as the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee knows—over the distribution of power among the Northwest States from projects owned and operated by the Federal Government on the Columbia River system.

Furthermore, there have been some protests from my State of Oregon, which predominantly is served by private utility companies, with respect to the operation of the preference clause in the neighboring State of Washington, where there are more publicly owned agencies.

So I should like to ask a few questions, for the purpose of clarification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am happy to have the questions asked by the Senator from Oregon, because I know he has studied the question, has conducted hearings on the problem, has prepared a brief on the subject, and is informed in regard to the principles and questions involved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Here is the first question I should like to ask. Under the operation of this reservation, as it has come before us in the conference report, would a private utility company in the State of South Dakota where the power project is located prevail over a public agency in another State with respect to power from a Corps of Engineers dam in South Dakota?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would depend upon whether the power was within this reservation of power. Within this reservation of power, it would.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Within the 50 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Within the 50 percent, it would.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, within the 50 percent portion of the output of that Federal dam, a private power company in South Dakota could prevail over a publicly owned system in another State?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, but I point out, in that connection, it is not the power company that prevails; it is the customers of the power company who prevail. The distribution of the power would be subject to the provision of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which provides that distribution shall be such as to accomplish the most widespread use and at the lowest possible rates consistent with good business, and those rates shall be subject to approval by the Federal Power Commission. So the benefit would go not to the utility, but to the consumer.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator for his answer to my first question.

The second question I should like to ask bears on how the power would be distributed within South Dakota, once a portion of that 50 percent had been made available to the private power company for distribution. Let us say in South Dakota there is a publicly owned system, such as a rural electric cooperative or a municipal system—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We have such systems in South Dakota. Water-

town and Pierre have municipally owned systems.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator for that information. Let us say the Watertown municipal system attempts to exercise the preference clause as against or opposed to a private power company in South Dakota, that has obtained some of the Federal kilowatts within the 50 percent reservation. Under those circumstances, would the Watertown municipal system be able to withdraw those kilowatts from the private power company in South Dakota that was obtaining them?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, it would, but I assume that sound management would require due notice. A system could not arbitrarily take power away from somebody and then release it. It would have to be done upon proper withdrawal notice.

Mr. NEUBERGER. All my questions are based on the assumption that it would be done in accordance with usual procedure in such withdrawals. I may be elliptical in asking my questions, but that assumption is included in them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All municipalities, like Watertown or Pierre, or rural electric cooperatives, or other public bodies, would be entitled to ask for the power which was being distributed through a private supplier or distributor, upon due notice. I might say I would hope, however, those agencies would have gotten the bulk of their demand taken care of out of the reservation or out of the power for which they had originally subscribed.

The particular problem in South Dakota has this aspect to it: Our REA's, as of today, are getting the power they can immediately contract for, but their demand load is growing and they are expanding, so that they are worried about the situation 5 or 10 years from now. The Secretary of the Interior had indicated he was going to "put on the block," so to speak, power from the Big Bend Dam, which is not yet constructed, but power from it will be subject to sale and contract next year. The rural electric cooperatives in my State, under schedules of growth, foresee a growing demand in 1961, 1962, 1965, and 1970; but next year, 1959, they cannot afford to contract for their power needs of 5 years from that date. If the Big Bend power should be put up for sale at the time the dam's construction was started, the REA's would be at a great disadvantage in trying to bid for power which they would not need for 5 or 10 years from now. This reservation of power is in their interest in that it reserves the block of power on which they will have the first call when the time comes when they need it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I understand that, and the questions I am asking the Senator from South Dakota are being voiced in an effort to ascertain just exactly how this power reservation will operate. One of the reasons why I am asking the question is precisely this: We have a situation in the Pacific Northwest which is not drastically different from that in the Missouri River Basin, as it was explained to us in our subcommittee by the Senator from South

Dakota. As I understand the situation in the Missouri River Basin, electricity is distributed predominantly by private utility companies in South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. While nearby, such as in the State of Nebraska, electricity is mainly distributed by publicly owned systems.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Practically 100 percent. The Missouri River forms the boundary between the two States. In fact, the north reaches of the river are in South Dakota, while the south reaches are in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As the Senator from South Dakota knows, having served on the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], in the Pacific Northwest there is a somewhat similar situation. The Columbia River, which is the greatest source of waterpower in the country, forms the border between Oregon and Washington. Most of the electric power in Oregon is distributed by private power companies, and a very substantial portion of the electricity in Washington State is distributed by public utility districts and municipally owned districts. Therefore, the two situations, one in the Columbia River Basin and the other in the Missouri River Basin, are not too different.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota this further question. Within the 50 percent reservation, as described in the conference report—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As described in the bill submitted in the conference report.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I accept the correction. I am grateful for it.

As submitted in the bill contained in the conference report, a private power company in South Dakota could prevail for itself and its customers as opposed to a publicly-owned system in another State when the power project is located in South Dakota. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Until such time as a public body or a preference group such as an REA should ask for power in South Dakota.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That was the next question I intended to ask. In other words, a preference body in the State of South Dakota could still prevail—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, and I anticipate eventually it will get the power.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, even though a private utility in South Dakota could withdraw power from a publicly owned system—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It could borrow it, so to speak, under the reservation, for a reasonable period of time, but recognizing it could be eventually withdrawn by a preference body.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Still, within the State of South Dakota, the preference customer—that is, the publicly owned system—would predominate, as opposed to the South Dakota private power company, for the Federal kilowatts. Is that accurate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the distribution of power.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for making clear exactly how this provision would operate as finally reported by the conference committee.

We have this interest in the Pacific Northwest. This colloquy certainly serves to inform me. I know the matter is important to other Members of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have this colloquy as a part of the legislative history.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the conference committee. I also congratulate the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the subcommittee. Both Senators have worked, I think, not only faithfully but very successfully in bringing forward the conference report bill.

As the Senator knows, there is one project in my State which will be without ability to claim the substantial appropriations contained in the present budget and in the present appropriation bill unless this particular authorization bill becomes law. I refer to the Central and South Florida Flood Control Project. I am therefore exceedingly anxious to know whether the bill is in such form that there can be no question about its approval by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and by the Bureau of the Budget. I know there have been long and protracted negotiations by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Oklahoma with both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. My question is: Am I correct in my understanding that as to all projects in the conference report bill accord has been reached among the committees of Congress, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The projects within the bill covered by the conference report are those which meet the requirements demanded by the Bureau of the Budget and by the executive department, and those only.

Mr. President, I express my gratitude and feeling of obligations to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his many days of work with the Bureau of the Budget in order to be able to present a conference report bill which we felt would be signed by the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I understand the bill, as to all of the projects, substantially meets the requirements of the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am pretty sure my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma can give the Senator some assurance in that regard.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the answer to the question is in the affirmative. Not only every project in the State of Florida but also every project in the conference report bill either is in accord with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers or has the approval both of the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers as the projects are provided for in the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly thank both of my distinguished friends. I think they have rendered a very great service not simply to my State but to the Nation in resolving a very difficult situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also wish to express the appreciation of all the Members of the Senate, I am sure, to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the other conferees on the part of the Senate who worked on this measure and who, with the help of associates on the Committee on Public Works, reported the conference bill to the Senate. I make particular reference to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has played such an important part in working out a solution to the problem; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who served as a conferee; our own ranking member on the committee, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]; and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has for so many years worked diligently on matters concerning public works.

I think there has been a splendid approach to the problem. The bill was originally presented to the Senate in a bipartisan manner and received the overwhelming support of the Members on both sides of the aisle. I believe the conference report bill is one which can be very promptly acted upon favorably by the President of the United States. We can then move ahead on a large number of these great public works projects which are important to our country.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without expressing appreciation for the long hours of service which went into bringing the matter to the point of final approval by the two Houses of Congress, so that it may be sent to the President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may state that there has never been a chairman of a committee who received better cooperation than the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I feel obligated to all members of the full committee in this instance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee for his able leadership and for his very effective cooperation. I also wish to thank the distinguished minority leader for his very kind remarks, and I wish further to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I should like to say, Mr. President, I have never worked on a piece of proposed legislation with reference to which there was finer cooperation by the members of the committee. Upon enactment, this legislation will be a milestone in the record of this body insofar as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned. After the bill was twice acted on by the Congress and twice vetoed, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, for his department and for the President, worked with the committee in a manner which was distinctly cooperative and constructively helpful. I am deeply grateful to each and every member of the committee—and especially to my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who spent so many hours on this matter with me, with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with his fine colleagues on his side of the aisle and those on my side of the aisle. Speaking for myself, as well as for my colleagues, I desire to express appreciation to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and his office for constructive help and a cooperative attitude in this matter, which made it possible for us to bring the conference report bill to the Senate with complete acceptance and approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate longer or delay the adoption of the conference report, but in view of the things which have been said I should like to speak very briefly with respect to the services of other Senators in this regard.

The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], himself deserves credit in connection with the achievement of this position with respect to a bill which was twice vetoed. The Senator from California was vitally interested in some of the projects which were in the bill which was vetoed. The Senator from California introduced a bill which would have made it possible for the Senate to approach the matter by simply accepting the projects which did not incur the disapproval of the President. However, the Senator from California did not take an arbitrary or selfish position in that matter by saying, "Let us only put through the projects, in which I and a few others are interested, which have the President's approval." Instead he took the position, "We will not press for the bill unless we can work out a solution which will provide for some of the other projects as well."

The Senator from Oklahoma—be it said to his everlasting credit—did not take the arbitrary position that we would

ride roughshod and force a vote on overriding the President's veto. I think possibly some political hay might have been made, from the standpoint of certain persons, had that been attempted, whether or not it would have resulted in the accomplishment of legislation.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], my senior on this committee, expressed our sentiments very well the other evening when the bill was under consideration in the Senate. He said, "We have here an example of the American system working in its best manner." He spoke of it as Americanism at its best.

Those words from a man like the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania come with good grace, because no man, after a long public career, is better able to interpret the American system than is the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, EDWARD MARTIN. We shall miss him next year. On another occasion I hope to speak at greater length expressing some of my respect and admiration for the Senator from Pennsylvania; but on this occasion I say to him that I think he said the right thing. The bill does represent the American system working at its best.

To the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I express the appreciation of all members of the subcommittee for their fine leadership of the committee as a whole. I hope they will continue to give us the benefit of their counsel from time to time. The Senator from New Mexico will be with us next year, I assume. I am sorry the Senator from Pennsylvania will not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, am sorry that the committee is to lose the benefit of the services of the Senator from Pennsylvania, a great Senator. The Senate itself will lose a Member who is highly respected, and who has contributed much to the American way of life.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything relative to the conference report, but I have been greatly moved by what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota have said.

I believe that this measure represents Americanism at its best. A prodigious amount of work has been done in connection with the bill. I express my appreciation for the work of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. As Senators know, I am the senior Republican on both the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Public Works. This year I have had a most difficult task. I have assigned much work to the senior Senator from South Dakota, and he has always performed in a wonderful manner.

At this time I wish to express my appreciation for the fine cordiality which exists in the Committee on Public Works. As the distinguished chairman has said, it has always been nonpolitical.

The work of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], in connection with the bill, is deserving of the highest commendation.

I wish also to commend the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He was certainly most unselfish in all this work. I think we have a fine bill. It has required a great amount of work. It is the fruit of a patriotic endeavor on the part of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of commendation for the work of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is now the fifth in seniority in the Senate, on the rivers and harbors bills.

I do not regard the projects in the bill as pork-barrel projects, as the executive department stated. The bill represents careful, skillful work on the part of both Houses, for the benefit of the American people.

It is necessary that rivers, harbors, and channels be deepened to accommodate our expanding trade, if both interstate trade and international trade are to continue.

There has been a constant increase in the size of seagoing vessels. Our commerce has been constantly expanding. There have been constantly increasing demands upon industry to bring forward new products which can contribute to a better way of life for many people.

There has also been a constantly increasing personal demand. With increasing technology each individual requires a greater quantity of the products of our mines, fields, and factories.

The bill will help all the people of the country. It will injure no one.

I am happy to have this opportunity to add my word of commendation for the fine work done. I attended some of the hearings, and found a uniform courtesy toward everyone, regardless of the project involved, and regardless of whether it was approved.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] on the very fine work he has done in connection with this bill. The Senator from New Mexico is one of the most influential, popular, and able Members of this body. He has done outstanding work in this field, and his service in the United States Senate has truly been outstanding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know that the conference report is a privileged matter. Nevertheless, I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi for the patience he has displayed.

I ask for the approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11645) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked

by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. DENTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 12, and 16 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1706) to amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was a member of the conference committee on the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

The report of the conferees, House Report No. 1980, was filed in the House of Representatives yesterday, and approved by that body today. My name appeared as a signer of this conference report, through error.

I do not approve of the action of the conferees in approving amendment No. 9, which, among other things, appropriates \$22.8 million for international educational exchange activities. The House of Representatives originally allowed \$20.8 million for this activity, and the Senate approved the amount of \$30.8 million.

In my estimation, had the conferees allowed the full \$30.8 million approved by the Senate, the amount would still have been inadequate for carrying on this program, which is of proven success, and has been an extremely vital activity in improving our foreign relations.

I think it is a most regrettable circumstance that the House insists upon curtailing this program within very narrow limits, while at the same time the House provides an extremely large increase over the budget figures for the military program; and, furthermore, in this morning's newspapers I noticed that the House has doubled the construction funds for the atomic energy activities.

Mr. President, for the reasons stated, I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we have heard much, and have read much in the public press and in magazines—most of which are supporting statehood for Alaska—about the law of the land. In fact, the cry since 1954 has been "This is the law of the land. The Supreme Court has spoken, and therefore it must be obeyed."

Today I intend to speak on the "law of the land."

From the time of the founding of the Republic until the present time, the Supreme Court has uniformly held that States can be admitted into the Union only on the basis of equality. Section 10 of the bill files in the face of the Constitution. I submit that the law of the land voids section 10 of the bill, and that the law of the land must be obeyed.

Section 10 was placed in the bill at the request of the Defense Department. It would prescribe a condition precedent to the admission of Alaska to the Union. There is no right, and no power on the part of Congress to place any conditions on the admission of a State to the Union. In a few minutes I shall discuss in some detail the decisions of the Supreme Court, which are the law of the land, and which the Senate should obey.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the constitutional issues presented by section 10 of this bill, which would authorize the President, by Executive order, to withdraw certain areas of the new State and by virtue of that Executive order the land so withdrawn would be completely under the dominion and sovereignty of the United States rather than under the State of Alaska during that period of withdrawal. This means that the approximately 24,000 citizens in the withdrawal area would be under the exclusive dominion and control of the Federal Government and even could be summarily evacuated at a moment's notice.

I submit that the reservation contained in section 10 is such a condition imposed upon the new State of Alaska as a price for admission into the Union of States that it does violence to the equal footing doctrine, whereby the preceding States entering this Union all entered on equal footing.

Mr. President, former Governor Gruening of Alaska, in his testimony before the committee testified that this was an unfavorable condition and that it was a precedent never before set in the history of our Republic.

What is the law? The leading case on the subject is *Coyle v. Oklahoma* (221 U. S. 559). The facts in that case show that Congress passed a law admitting Oklahoma into the Union. It placed on the admittance of the State of Oklahoma

the condition that the State capital must be located at the town of Guthrie, and that the State capital could not be moved by State authority until 1913. The act was passed, as I recall, in 1906. It also provided that the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma could not appropriate money for the construction of the necessary State buildings at the new State capital.

When Oklahoma was admitted to the Union, the legislature immediately removed the capital to Oklahoma City, and appropriated money for its construction. A part of the reservation in the act Congress passed reads as follows:

That the Constitutional Convention provided for herein shall, by ordinance irrevocable, accept the terms and conditions of this act.

The Supreme Court said:

The only question for review by us is whether the provision of the enabling act was a valid limitation upon the power of the State after its admission, which overrides any subsequent State legislation repugnant thereto.

I am reading from the majority opinion of the Court in *Coyle against Oklahoma*:

The question then comes to this: Can a State be placed upon a plane of inequality with its sister States in the Union if the Congress chooses to impose conditions which so operate, at the time of its admission? The argument is that while Congress may not deprive a State of any power which it possesses, it may as a condition to the admission of a new State, constitutionally restrict its authority, to the extent at least, of suspending its powers for a definite time in respect to the location of its seat of government.

I am still reading from the opinion written by Mr. Justice Lurton:

The definition of a "State" is found in the powers possessed by the original States which adopted the Constitution, a definition emphasized by the terms employed in all subsequent acts of Congress admitting new States into the Union. The first two States admitted into the Union were the States of Vermont and Kentucky, one as of March 4, 1791, and the other as of June 1, 1792. No terms or conditions were exacted from either. Each act declares that the State is admitted "as a new and entire member of the United States of America."

This Union was and is a Union of States equal in power, dignity, and authority, each competent to exert that residuum of sovereignty not delegated to the United States by the Constitution itself. To maintain otherwise would be to say that the Union, through the power of Congress to admit new States, might come to a Union of States unequal in power, as including States whose powers were restricted only by the Constitution, with others whose powers had been further restricted by act of Congress accepted as a condition of admission.

Thus, it would result, first, that the powers of Congress would not be defined by the Constitution alone but, in respect to new States, enlarged or restricted by the conditions imposed upon new States by its own legislation admitting them into the Union; and, second, that such new States might not exercise all of the powers which had not been delegated by the Constitution, but only such as had not been further bargained away as conditions of admission.

The argument that Congress derives, from the duty of guaranteeing to each State in this Union a republican form of government, power to impose restrictions upon a

new State which deprives it of equality with other members of the Union has no merit. It may imply the duty of such new State to provide itself with such State government, and impose upon Congress the duty of seeing that such form is not changed to one anti-republican.

I read further from the decision:

Emphatic and significant as is the phrase admitted as "an entire member," even stronger was the declaration upon the admission in 1796 of Tennessee, as the third new State, it being declared to be "one of the United States of America," "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever," phraseology which has ever since been substantially followed in admission acts, concluding with the Oklahoma act, which declares that Oklahoma shall be admitted "on an equal footing with the original States."

Mr. President, what would happen under section 10 of the bill? The President of the United States is authorized, without a declaration of martial law, to withdraw sovereignty from over half of the area of the State of Alaska.

The President of the United States is empowered under the withdrawal provisions of the bill to displace State officers and to appoint Federal officers to enforce the laws of the State provided that the laws of the State do not conflict with the Federal statute. The hearings show, without contradiction, that there would not even be a system of uniform State taxation, because the legislature of the new State could not pass a law which conflicted with a Federal statute.

What it amounts to is a withdrawal of the sovereignty which Congress has no power to include as a condition for the admittance of Alaska.

I shall finish reading the opinion of the Supreme Court; then I shall discuss the resolutions under which other States were admitted to the Union. The Oklahoma case is the law of the land. It is the law of the land which the newspapers and magazines always say must be obeyed.

Mr. President, I shall conclude reading from the opinion in the *Coyle* case. The Court said:

Has Oklahoma been admitted upon an equal footing with the Original States? If she has, she by virtue of her jurisdictional sovereignty as such a State may determine for her own people the proper location of the local seat of government. She is not equal in power to them if she cannot.

In *Texas v. White* (7 Wall. 700, 725), Chief Justice Chase said in strong and memorable language that, "the Constitution, in all of its provisions looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States."

In *Lane County v. Oregon* (7 Wall. 76), he said:

"The people of the United States constitute one Nation, under one Government, and this Government, within the scope of the powers with which it is invested, is supreme. On the other hand, the people of each State compose a State, having its own government, and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence. The States disunited might continue to exist. Without the States in union there could be no such political body as the United States."

To this we may add that the constitutional equality of the States is essential to the harmonious operation of the scheme upon which the Republic was organized. When that equality disappears we may remain a free

people, but the Union will not be the Union of the Constitution.

Under the principles enunciated in the *Coyle* case, I submit that if section 10 remains in the bill, Alaska will not enter the Union on an equal footing with all the other States.

Mr. President, as I said, the President could displace the officials of the new State of Alaska, and could appoint Federal officials in their stead, and there would be no State courts, but their functions would be taken over by Federal courts, at the whim of the President. I submit that would not place Alaska on an equal footing; that would not be the equality between the States which is a very fundamental of the United States system of Government.

I submit that this section is unconstitutional; and at the proper time I shall raise the point of order, and shall let the Senate vote upon the constitutionality of this section.

Mr. President, *Coyle* against Smith is a landmark case standing for the fact that when a new State is admitted to the Union, it is admitted with all the powers of sovereignty and jurisdiction which pertain to the original States, and such powers may not be constitutionally diminished, impaired, or shorn away by any conditions, compacts, or stipulations embraced in the act under which the new State came into the Union, which would not be valid and effectual if the subject of Congressional legislation after admission.

In *United States v. Texas* (339 U. S. 707), at page 716, the Court said:

The "equal-footing" clause has long been held to refer to political rights and to sovereignty. (See *Stearns v. Minnesota* (179 U. S. 223, 245).) It does not, of course, include economic stature or standing. There has never been equality among the States in that sense. Some States when they entered the Union had within their boundaries tracts of land belonging to the Federal Government; others were sovereigns of their soil. Some had special agreements with the Federal Government governing property within their borders. (See *Stearns v. Minnesota*, supra, pp. 243-245.) Area, location, geology, and latitude have created great diversity in the economic aspects of the several States. The requirement of equal footing was designed not to wipe out those diversities, but to create parity as respects political standing and sovereignty.

Mr. President, I should like to be told of any other State in the Union in which the President can displace State officials or can appoint Federal officials to administer the laws of the State and try people for offenses under State law in the Federal court system. That condition was placed there at the request of the Defense Department and the Department of the Interior. I believe this bill is fatally defective and that Alaska should not be forced to ratify this condition for admission to the Union. It was placed there to meet the objection of the President of the United States, who, in a press conference, if I correctly remember reading the *New York Times* index, stated that the southern part of Alaska should be made a State and the northern areas should be a Territory. There is an attempt to meet that objection, but in meeting the objection the

Constitution of the United States has been violated.

The argument was made during the Senate hearings that when the State of Wyoming was admitted to the Union there was a reservation of Yellowstone National Park to the Federal Government, and that was the only reason given to justify the constitutionality, the legality, of the withdrawal provisions of this bill. What are the facts? Yellowstone Park was reserved by an act of Congress when Wyoming was a Territory in 1872. Wyoming was admitted to the Union 18 years later.

The United States Supreme Court has spoken on the question in the case of *Martin against Waddell*, when it said:

Full power is given to Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property of the United States. This authorized the passage of all laws necessary to secure the rights of the United States to the public lands and their sale and to protect them from taxation.

But that is not the issue here, Mr. President. The issue is the power of the President to withdraw State sovereignty from half the Territory of Alaska. Once a State is in the Union, it cannot withdraw from the Union. It cannot be put out of the Union. Not one scintilla of sovereignty can be withdrawn by the President, by the Congress, by the courts, or by anyone else from the States.

Here is a late case, *Alabama v. Texas* (347 U. S.). At page 275, Mr. Justice Reed, in a concurring opinion, stated:

The fact that Alabama and the defendant States were admitted into the Union "upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever . . . does not affect Congress' power to dispose of Federal property. The requirement of equal footing does not demand that courts wipe out diversities "in the economic aspects of the several States," but calls for "parity as respects political standing and sovereignty" (*United States v. Texas*, supra, at 716). The power of Congress to cede property to one State without corresponding cession to all States has been consistently recognized.

The argument is made, Why was the Federal Government given jurisdiction over certain lands in the State of Arizona and in the State of New Mexico? That was one of the reasons given in committee to justify the withdrawal provisions of this bill. But what are the facts? Jurisdiction over those lands was given by the sovereign State of New Mexico and the sovereign State of Arizona. It was done by State action; it was not Federal action. In the Arizona case the act was passed by the legislature of that State in 1951, I am informed.

The United States Supreme Court, in *Ex parte Webb* (225 U. S. 663), at page 690, had this to say:

It is not our purpose to qualify the doctrine established by repeated decisions of this Court that the admission of a new State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States imparts an equality of power over internal affairs.

The most recent decision of this Court upon the subject of the proper construction of acts of Congress passed for the admission of new States into the Union is *Coyle v. Smith* (221 U. S. 559), where it was held that the Okla-

homa Enabling Act (34 Stat., c. 3335, p. 267), in providing that the capital of the State should temporarily be at the city of Guthrie, and should not be changed therefrom previous to the year 1913, ceased to be a limitation upon the power of the State after its admission. The Court, however, was careful to state (221 U. S. 574): "It may well happen that Congress should embrace in an enactment introducing a new State into the Union legislation intended as a regulation of commerce among the States, or with Indian tribes situated within the limits of such new State, or regulations touching the sole care and disposition of the public lands or reservations therein, which might be upheld as legislation within the sphere of the plain power of Congress. But in every such case such legislation would derive its force not from any agreement or compact with the proposed new State, nor by reason of its acceptance of such enactment as a term of admission, but solely because the power of Congress extended to the subject, and therefore would not operate to restrict the State's legislative power in respect of any matter which was not plainly within the regulating power of Congress."

Mr. President, where is the equality of power over internal affairs in Alaska?

In the case of *Case v. Toftus*, 39 Federal Reports, 730, at page 732, the Court said:

The doctrine that new States must be admitted into the Union on an "equal footing" with the old ones does not rest on any express provision of the constitution, which simply declares (art. 4, sec. 3) "new States may be admitted by Congress into this Union," but on what is considered and has been held by the Supreme Court to be the general character and purpose of the union of the States, as established by the constitution, a union of political equals. (*Pollard v. Hagan* (3 How. 233); *Permoli v. New Orleans* (1d. 609); *Strader v. Graham* (10 How. 92).)

There is no equality here when 24,000 people, on orders of the President, can be evacuated from their place of abode—not after martial law has been declared, not after a national emergency has been proclaimed. What is held in all these cases is that, as a condition of admission, or after admission, a State cannot be deprived of its sovereignty.

Section 10 of the bill would certainly deprive the new State of Alaska of her sovereignty in over half of the Territory and would vest that power in the President of the United States.

The Supreme Court spoke again, Mr. President. The decisions run down to the present time.

In *Boyd v. Thayer* (143 U. S. 135), at page 170, the Court said:

Admission on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever, involves equality of constitutional right and power, which cannot thereafter be controlled, and it also involves the adoption as citizens of the United States of those whom Congress makes members of the political community, and who are recognized as such in the formation of the new State with the consent of Congress.

I submit that the power given in the bill to take over State functions in more than half of the area of the new State—to suspend statehood, as my distinguished friend from Idaho said, would be a suspension of statehood in such area—is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

In *Escanaba Company v. Chicago* (107 U. S. 678, at p. 688), Mr. Justice Field, speaking for the Supreme Court, said:

Whatever the limitation upon her powers as a government whilst in a territorial condition, whether from the ordinance of 1787 or the legislation of Congress, it ceased to have any operative force, except as voluntarily adopted by her, after she became a State of the Union. On her admission she at once became entitled to and possessed of all the rights of dominion and sovereignty which belonged to the original States. She was admitted, and could be admitted, only on the same footing with them. . . . Equality of the constitutional right and power is the condition of all the States of the Union, old and new.

Next there is a Florida case. What did the Court say about "equal footing"?

In *Skiriotes v. Florida* (313 U. S. 69), at page 77, the Court said:

If the United States may control the conduct of its citizens upon the high seas, we see no reason why the State of Florida may not likewise govern the conduct of its citizens upon the high seas with respect to matters in which the State has a legitimate interest and where there is no conflict with acts of Congress. Save for the powers committed by the Constitution to the Union, the State of Florida has retained the status of a sovereign. Florida was admitted to the Union "on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever" (act of March 3, 1845, 5 Stat. 742). And the power given to Congress by section 3 of article IV of the Constitution to admit new States relates only to such States as are equal to each other "in power, dignity and authority, each competent to exert that residuum of sovereignty not delegated to the United States by the Constitution itself" (*Coyle v. Smith* (221 U. S. 559, 567)).

Mr. Justice Lurton's opinions in *Coyle versus Oklahoma*, cited supra, were cited with approval in *State v. Towessnute*, (154 Pacific Reporter, 805, at p. 809), wherein the Supreme Court of Washington said:

In *Coyle v. Smith* (221 U. S. 559, 31 Sup. Ct. 688, 55 L. Ed. 853), Oklahoma was relieved of a feature of its admission act that attempted to fix the location of its capital city. Congress, it was held, had no power to admit states under conditions unequal in these respects.

In *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Company v. Taylor* (192 Pacific, 349, at p. 354), the Supreme Court of Oklahoma said:

But it is argued that plaintiff in error acquired its right of way from the United States, and that its franchise operates as a contract between it and the Federal Government, exempting it from the power of the State to require the railroad to do anything additional at highway crossings. Suffice it to say that, prior to the admission of Oklahoma as a State, the Federal Government held in trust the police power of the future state, and as the trustee thereof had no power to enter into any contract (and it did not in this case) with a corporation or individual to abrogate, barter away, or limit the inherent sovereignty of the future state. To hold otherwise would be a denial of the constitutional right of a new state to be admitted on an equal footing with the original states. The Federal Government has no authority, prior to the admission of a future state, to enter into any contract with a corporation or individual to exempt such individual or corporation from the exercise by

the future state of all the sovereignty possessed and vested in one of the original states. While the Federal Government had full sovereignty in the Indian Territory at the time the act of Congress of March 2, 1887, was passed (*Late Corp. of L. D. S. v. United States* (136 U. S. 1-68, 10 Sup. Ct. 792, 34 L. Ed. 478); *Chicago, Rock Island & Pac. R. Co. v. Gist* (decided by this Court June 15, 1920) 190 Pac. 878), and was vested with the police powers in the territories (*United States v. DeWitt* (9 Wall. 41, 19 L. Ed. 593); *Moses v. United States* (16 App. D. C. 428, 50 L. R. A. 532; 14 Cyc. 528)), it had no authority, under the Federal Constitution, to surrender or contract away the police power of the future state.

Mr. President, does not the bill surrender or attempt to contract away the police power of the new State of Alaska, inasmuch as State courts can be superseded and Federal courts can act in their stead by order of the President of the United States? State officials can be displaced and Federal officials appointed in their stead by the President of the United States; and the State legislature cannot exercise sovereignty over half the area of the State because of a lack of power to pass laws in such area under State sovereignty which might conflict with a Federal statute?

Mr. President, we hear much about the chipping away, point by point, of the Constitution of our country and of our system of government. I have heard much to the effect that the Supreme Court has spoken and that what it says is the law of the land and must be obeyed. The magazines and newspapers which support the admission of Alaska day in and day out hammer that thesis home: The Supreme Court decision is the law of the land; it must be obeyed.

Now, there cannot be any conflict. There cannot be any question in this instance. The Supreme Court has spoken. It has spoken innumerable times throughout the entire history of this country, down to the present time.

It is the law of the land. Will the United States Senate obey the law of the land? That is the question which will confront each Senator when the point of order is raised. What are the facts in connection with the bill? This bill was not even considered by a Senate committee. The pending bill was considered in the House of Representatives, and in the appropriate committee of the House, 69 amendments were written into the bill. It is brought here without consideration by a Senate committee. I should like to know what kind of legislation that is.

In connection with the Senate bill, which is not before us, there were only 2 days of hearings. I am confident that these glaring holes would have been closed had the committee carefully gone into the bill.

The hearings conducted afford ample justification for the statement that the withdrawal authority contained in section 10 imposes such a condition as would deprive Alaska of the opportunity of entering the Union on an equal footing with the other States.

The hearings further confirm my view to the effect that the residents of Alaska have not caught the full significance of the requirement of section

10, in that, to all intents and purposes, it would suspend statehood in the areas of withdrawal, and that there is no precedent for the imposition of such a condition upon a new State.

I invite attention to the colloquy between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and former Governor Gruening of Alaska, on page 33 of the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I charge that there is no precedent for such a far-reaching condition being placed upon statehood.

Governor Gruening is a very able man. He probably knows more about statehood procedure than any other man in the United States. If Alaska were to be admitted as a State, I would hope that he might grace this body as a Senator. I read from page 33 of the hearings:

Senator CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Governor just a few questions.

About 10 years ago, Governor, this bill was before the House. Are the contents about the same as that bill?

Mr. GRUENING. No; it is not the same. The bill that was before the House, one of several bills, was a less generous bill and did not make the provisions for land that have now been incorporated in the bill both before the Senate and before the House.

Senator CARROLL. Is this request by the Secretary of the Interior setting aside land; is there precedence for this in other States who have been seeking statehood?

Mr. GRUENING. No, Senator Carroll; there is not.

Frankly, we do not see any particular reason for it since the Federal Government, the President, could, for military reasons, withdraw any part of Alaska, which is largely public domain, for defense purposes.

But if that is what the administration requests and if that is a condition for the granting of statehood, we see no objection to it.

The Supreme Court, without exception, has held that there can be no condition to the granting of statehood. A former governor, the man who is leading the fight for statehood, admits that section 10 constitutes a condition for the granting of statehood. That is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I quote further from the testimony of former Governor Gruening:

The important fact is that in contrast with our fears that there is to be partition of Alaska. It is all going to be part of the State; no part is going to be left out and the people living in those areas that are designated as possible areas of withdrawal will have the full rights of citizenship. Local government will go on. That is what the Department of the Interior officials have promised in behalf of the Eisenhower administration.

Now, as I suggested, in response to a previous question from Senator Church, if when the committee examines the fine print and finds that there are no undue qualifications of the assurances that were given us orally and to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by Representatives of the Interior Department, we see no objection to it. But what is intended should be clearly spelled out and the rights of the Alaskans in the areas stipulated for withdrawal, guaranteed by proper language.

Governor Gruening places his finger on the crux of the situation when he states that there is no precedent for such a condition being imposed on the new

State of Alaska, and that no other State entering the Union has had to bear such a condition precedent to its admission into the Union.

What legal effect would verbal assurances given the former governor by officials of the Department of the Interior have? I submit that that is foolishness, and that a vote for the bill with section 10 in it would violate the Constitution of the United States.

Delegate BARTLETT, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in favor of the statehood bill, stated that he spoke for all Alaskans; that the principle of the President making military withdrawals is perfectly acceptable to the Alaskan people; and that he has not had a single objection to it from any source within the Territory.

The following colloquy between Delegate BARTLETT and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] highlights the fact that there may not have been any objection, but, at the same time, the people of Alaska are unaware of what this withdrawal authority would do to the new State. I quote:

Senator JACKSON. Delegate BARTLETT, what is the reasoning behind that request? Do you know?

Delegate BARTLETT. No, but I have tried for years to find out. I have not the slightest idea.

Senator JACKSON. The last time we were told we were in a better position to defend the area if it remained a Territory. I would assume, as I suggested at the time, that if that reasoning were sound, then the State of Washington should be changed from a State to a Territory so that it would be stronger because it is the closest point to a Russian airfield. I have never been able to get the reasoning behind the move.

Delegate BARTLETT. I do not know if this will enlighten you, Mr. Chairman, I rather doubt that it will, but I can report to you that the House subcommittee was told that it was a form of insurance considered desirable and even necessary.

Senator JACKSON. Maybe we ought to get the Soviets on their side to withdraw part of their land to make it a sort of buffer area.

Delegate BARTLETT. The proposal was acceptable to Alaskans, I might add, because of the fact that it did not propose to diminish the boundaries of Alaska.

All of Alaska, as we now know it, would remain the State of Alaska.

Senator JACKSON. You mean that the present Territory of Alaska would be included in the State, but—

Delegate BARTLETT. Yes; and north and west of this line—

Senator JACKSON. Would that area be part of the new State?

Delegate BARTLETT. That area would be part of the new State. That, of course, is the principal reason why the administration's proposal was quickly adopted by Alaskans.

I might add that this area comprises something like 270,000 square miles.

The President can withdraw State authority from 270,000 square miles and substitute Federal authority, if the pending bill is passed.

Senator CHURCH. The area to be withdrawn?

Delegate BARTLETT. Not necessarily, Senator Church, to be withdrawn.

The area within which the President might make withdrawals. We do not know whether he will ever make any such, but he will have authority to do so.

Senator JACKSON. He has that authority now.

Delegate BARTLETT. Yes, he has that authority because all except a small fraction of 1 percent of that 270,000-square-mile area lies within the public domain.

However, it was asserted that another reason for the desire to bring about this arrangement was that thereafter it would be impossible to apply exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

I call particular attention to that point. Without such an arrangement it would be impossible in the future to apply exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Of course it is impossible for the Federal Government to have exclusive Federal jurisdiction within a State without its consent. There we have an admission on the part of Delegate BARTLETT that the bill violates the Constitution of the United States.

Senator JACKSON. The Soviets might construe that as being aggressive. We are setting up a big military zone right opposite the Soviet Union. Little Norway, little Finland, little Sweden, all adjoining the Soviet Union made no withdrawals and they don't seem to be afraid.

I do not quite understand this reasoning.

The distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Idaho asked very intelligent questions. I agree with the reasoning both of them used in committee, particularly the Senator from Idaho, when he said, as is reported in the record:

Except that here—and this is the unique feature in the Alaskan case—this very, very large area is being marked off and the Federal Government is given, in effect, the power to suspend full statehood—

I call attention to this particularly—in that area. Such a proposal is unheard of under our system of government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the understanding that he does not lose the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With that understanding, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS SARDAR MOHAMMAD DAUD, PRIME MINISTER OF AFGHANISTAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair be authorized to appoint a committee to escort the Prime Minister of Afghanistan into the Chamber of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the

Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] the committee to escort the Prime Minister of Afghanistan into the Chamber of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, subject to the same conditions upon which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] yielded the floor prior to the last quorum call, I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the conditions stipulated by the Senator from Montana, that the Senator from Mississippi will not lose the floor, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess,

His Royal Highness Sardar Mohammad Daud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. WILEY, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by His Excellency Mohammad Hashim Maiwandwal, Ambassador of Afghanistan; His Excellency Dr. Mohammad Yusuf, Minister of Mines and Industries; His Excellency Mohammad Sarwar, Deputy Minister of Commerce; Mr. Mohammad Ayoub Aziz, Deputy Chief of Protocol; Mr. Mohammad Khalid Roashan, press attaché; Miss Obee O'Brien, Office of Permanent Delegate to the United Nations from Afghanistan.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted to places assigned to them on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate and our guests: It is my high honor and privilege to present to the Members of the Senate the representatives of a government and a people whose fight for independence and to maintain their independence has won the admiration and respect of the people of the world throughout the years: His Royal Highness, the Prime Minister of Afghanistan.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS SARDAR MOHAMMAD DAUD, PRIME MINISTER OF AFGHANISTAN

Thereupon, from his place on the rostrum, the Prime Minister of Afghanistan delivered an address, which was

translated by His Excellency Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations, as follows:

Mr. Vice President and honorable and distinguished Members of the Senate, it is an honor and a privilege to have the pleasure of meeting with you in this august gathering.

I am overwhelmed by the warm reception and the cordial hospitality of the Government and the people of the United States, for which I express my heartfelt gratitude.

I am very happy that the kind invitation of President Eisenhower has made it possible for me to visit the United States, and my pleasure is all the greater for having this opportunity to convey to you and, through you, to the people of the United States the great, friendly aspirations of the people of Afghanistan.

This message of friendship of the Afghan people to the people of America does not stem only from the good diplomatic relations existing between our countries; it has a sounder source, which is the conviction of our peoples in the principles which the Afghans and the Americans alike consider to be the basis of their existence and, in fact, the basis of any existence with human dignity. This is a spiritual bond; and such bonds are of great value to our people, particularly in view of the fact that they are the best means of creating and continuing friendship between different peoples and nations. This is the basis of the policy of neutrality of Afghanistan concerning our international relationships.

Afghanistan is a country whose people are far behind many peoples, so far as the material developments of the modern age are concerned. But we have a deep conviction and a strong faith in the spiritual realities of life, from which we derive our confidence in the ultimate success of our own people and of other people in the attainment of the aspirations which lead to the happiness of mankind. That is why we can always speak of great and everlasting hope for ourselves and our friends. [Applause.]

Among our friends, our relations with the United States of America were established on the firm basis of true knowledge, on the part of the Afghan people, of the principles which constitute the American way of life.

These relations have continued in ever-increasing measure, in a spirit of mutual respect, confidence, and good understanding. The further strengthening and expansion of these friendly relations is the sincere and living desire of the Afghan people. [Applause.]

While the people of the United States endeavor to realize their own aspirations, we in Afghanistan are engaged in the same pursuit for our people; but our task is markedly different. Ours is a task of reconstruction from the ruins of the past and the reestablishment of a modern life on the site of the old civilizations. As a result of our engagement in the defense of our independence and freedom during the last two centuries, we have been left with great problems. Only recently have we been able to think

of embarking upon a program of putting our house in order.

Our experiences in this connection have taught us not to forget our sufferings and not to trust any policy which might allow the dark days of the past to beset us again, but, rather, to favor a policy through which we can look forward to an atmosphere of good understanding, in which our difficulties would be appreciated. To us, this is the only way in which the nations of the world can enjoy mutual confidence on the basis of international justice, which is essentially needed by the peoples of the world at the present time. [Applause.]

Our hope to succeed in our efforts is obviously of vital importance to us. The success depends not only upon our own efforts, but also on the maintenance of peace and security in the world in which we live.

Therefore I can say that, the achievement of our national goal being dependent on international peace and security, our national and international aims are ultimately the same. That is why our policies in all directions are founded on the principle of friendship with all peoples and nations of the world.

For the achievement of our aims we do not have many means to speak of; however, there is one thing on which we can rely, that is, our confidence in the spirit of our people and their determination to give their utmost efforts, free from any influence and motivated only by an independent judgment to overcome the great difficulties which confront us.

This in no way means that we plan to ignore or slight the importance of good understanding and international cooperation. On the contrary, we are fully convinced of the essentiality of international cooperation and we have given expression to this conviction on any proper opportunity, and we shall continue to do so.

The history of the Afghan-American relations can provide us with many examples of such cooperation. I wish to express my appreciation of the good will and understanding which have always prevailed between our two countries.

In this atmosphere of friendship among the great American people, it gives me the greatest of pleasure, while I am enjoying their hospitality, to represent the wishes of my people for the prosperity and happiness of the American people. Let me tell you that these privileged moments that I have spent among you will remain with me as an everlasting memory of my visit to your great country.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will have an opportunity to meet His Royal Highness in the well of the Chamber. We also have with us the Ambassador from Afghanistan, and members of the Cabinet.

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. KNOWLAND.

Following the informal reception, the Prime Minister and those accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

At 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CLARK in the chair).

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, does the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] have a right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair was in error in recognizing the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wisconsin under the same conditions on which I have heretofore yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM FOR THE SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have spoken of the need for having in this august Chamber a system whereby people in the Gallery could hear at least some of the words spoken on the Senate floor. They can hear me now. With a public-address system the visitors in the gallery could have heard today the voice of the distinguished visitor to the Senate. I am sure they did not hear his voice. I also noticed some Senators were leaning forward in their seats, seeking to hear what was said.

On other occasions I have mentioned that the voice of the majority leader has not carried sufficiently so that I, sitting two seats back, could hear what was said.

I think that in the interest of commonsense we ought to have a public address system installed, whereby at least the Senators could hear what was being said. I am sure those who come to the galleries do so with the idea not simply of looking at our grey heads or bald heads, but with the idea that they want to hear what is being said on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. President, at each Senator's desk there is an ink well. There used to be sand in the "sand shaker."

Some time ago I wrote a letter to the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the installation of a public address system so that in 1958, 1959, and in the years to come we could have the facility which is used in every other place of

public assembly. I wrote the Architect a letter and asked him to find out what it would cost to install such a system as I have mentioned. The Architect has written me a very fine 2-page letter describing the cost of such a system.

I talked to someone else once before about installing such a system, because I had understood, in conformity with the decision of a committee which had charge of the matter some time ago, when the Chamber was being remodeled, that empty conduits had been installed in the Chamber beneath the floor. The Architect says that is true. He says:

Capped outlet boxes were also installed at the floor level in the area of the Senators' desks, at the Vice President's desk, at the clerks' desks, and in the well.

I wish to say parenthetically that many times I have not been able to hear the mild, modulated voice of the Vice President.

In the interest of facilitating the business of the Senate, we should have something along this line. Having done a little campaigning in my day, I know I can turn a little knob, switch the current into the microphone, and my voice can be heard 1,000 feet down one way and 1,000 feet down the other way on the common country village street.

I know plugs could be installed in what was once the "sand shakers" and a voice box could be given to the Senator who desired to address the Senate so his voice could be heard throughout the Chamber.

I shall ask that the letter, giving the particulars with respect to what the Architect thinks about the cost and what would be advisable, be printed in the Record following my remarks.

Since the Architect thinks it would be necessary to have two operators, let me say I feel it would not be necessary to have any operators. The Senator addressing the Senate could simply have the apparatus given to him as we are given a reading stand. When requested, a reading stand is brought to the Senator's desk. The loud-speaking apparatus could be brought to the Senator's desk, and when he began to speak the Presiding Officer, or someone else, could turn the switch and the speech would be on.

The statement has been made, Senators talk among themselves, and they do not want their conversations to be heard. The conversations of Senators could not be heard for the simple reason that the loudspeaking system would apply only when plugged into the particular spot from which a Senator was speaking. When the Senator having the floor finished speaking, some other Senator who desired to keep his voice in shape instead of speaking as loud as I am talking now, could call for the loudspeaker. We could have 2 or 3 of them to serve the purpose.

I bring up this subject, Mr. President, because a couple of weeks ago an American diplomat sat in the gallery and I later heard him criticize the acoustic situation. I think that in the interest of facilitating Senate business, we should do something. If we cannot get something done along this line at this session,

perhaps remarks like these will accelerate getting something done in the next session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Architect be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1958.
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Reference is made to your letter of March 26, 1958, and subsequent telephone call regarding the proposal to install a public-address system in the Senate Chamber, United States Capitol.

When plans were being prepared for the remodeling of the Senate Chamber, the matter of providing a public-address system in the Chamber was discussed with the special committee in charge of the work and the committee agreed to the following:

(1) That a public-address system should not be installed, unless such a system should prove necessary after the acoustical improvement proposed had been made.

(2) That the necessary conduits and accessories should be installed to permit future installation of a public-address system, should such a system be desired by the Senate at a later date.

In conformity with these decisions of the committee, in remodeling the Chamber in 1949-51, empty conduits were installed in the plenum chamber beneath the floor to permit future installation of a public-address system. Capped outlet boxes were also installed at the floor level in the area of the Senators' desks, at the Vice President's desk, at the clerks' desks, and in the well. No actual wiring was installed.

After considering several alternatives for a public-address system for the Senate Chamber, we feel that the system described, as follows, comprises the features which will meet the particular needs of the Senate at this time:

Necessary wiring would be installed in the conduits beneath the floor and from the floor outlets to the "sand shakers" on the desks of Senators. An outlet would be installed in "sand shaker" space on each Senator's desk, where a microphone could be easily plugged in by a page when desired by a Senator.

Necessary wiring and accessories would be installed to make possible installation of microphones at other locations in the Chamber, as follows: On the Vice President's desk; on the table in front of the Vice President's desk; in the well of the Chamber.

It is recommended that 10 microphones be furnished with the original installation and that additional microphones be procured at a later date if experience indicates they are required. The 10 microphones would be furnished with both floor and desk stands so that they could be used at any of the outlets in the Chamber.

Necessary recessed-type loud speakers would be installed in the Chamber wall back of the rostrum and in the ceiling.

Other equipment to be installed includes amplifiers, operator's control station, microphone jacks, wiring, and all other appurtenances to complete the system.

All equipment would be of the highest quality.

The estimated cost of furnishing, installing, and operating the system is as follows: Furnishing and installing system, \$25,000; compensation of two operators (annual charge), \$11,400.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the United Press, a very reliable news agency, has issued the following news dispatch, which I shall read:

Interior Secretary Seaton made a personal appeal to Members of the Senate to support Alaska's plea for "political equality" by granting it statehood.

Mr. President, it has been demonstrated beyond any peradventure of a doubt that Secretary Seaton is a man who is leading the fight against political equality for Alaska, because under the pending bill 24,000 of her citizens will become second-class citizens, who can be shunted around and moved at the direction of the President of the United States.

I quote further:

In a letter to each Senator, Seaton said the House-passed bill represents a "workable compromise on many conflicting issues" involved in the Alaskan question.

"In my sincere opinion, the facts demonstrate that Alaskans are ready for statehood," he said.

"President Eisenhower has urged enactment of legislation to admit Alaska. In their 1956 platforms, both major political parties pledged immediate statehood for Alaska. I earnestly hope for favorable consideration by the Senate of the House-passed bill."

Mr. President, the House-passed bill has not even been considered by the Senate committee. The House-passed bill had 69 amendments included by the House committee. They did not have any consideration by the Senate committee. I think a Cabinet officer is going pretty far to request that the United States Senate destroy the legislative process. I read further:

In addition to the letter, Seaton dispatched several of his aides to the Capitol to line up support for the bill.

I do not believe all the aids of Secretary Seaton and all the aids of every other Cabinet member who supports the bill can induce the United States Senate to destroy the Constitution of the United States. There cannot be any question of what is involved.

I was quoting a few moments ago the testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I shall continue with the questions asked by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. Their statements were very able; they were very intelligent; they were to the point. I certainly agree with the reasoning of these two very distinguished Senators.

Senator CHURCH. The area to be withdrawn?

Delegate BARTLETT. Not necessarily, Senator CHURCH, to be withdrawn. The area within which the President might make withdrawals. We do not know whether he will ever make any such, but he will have authority to do so.

Senator JACKSON. He has that authority now.

Delegate BARTLETT. Yes. He has that authority because all except a small fraction

of 1 percent of that 270,000 square-mile area lies within the public domain. However, it was asserted that another reason for the desire to bring about this arrangement was that thereafter it would be impossible to apply exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. President, every lawyer knows that it is absolutely impossible to have exclusive Federal jurisdiction within the borders of a State without the consent of the State itself.

Delegate BARTLETT. I do not pretend to understand what the reasoning is. However, I must say that the arrangement explained by administration witnesses on the House side said in effect that the State laws would control in the withdrawn areas, although enforcement thereafter would be by the Federal Government.

That is an impossibility.

Senator JACKSON. Then what do they hope to achieve by this? That is the thing I do not understand.

Unless they want to have complete military control over the area, I do not see why they should make this request.

Delegate BARTLETT. It will be explained tomorrow to you by Under Secretary Chilson.

Senator JACKSON. They did not explain it last year, 2 years ago, and they tried all morning. They were never able to give a logical reason why this needed to be done. They just said it would make it possible for them to move in the area rather freely, overriding, I guess, the rights of the people.

That was the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. He was right when he said that the Federal Government would be able to override the rights of the people of the new State of Alaska. Of course, the Federal Government cannot deprive a citizen of a State of the inherent rights which he receives, guaranteed under the Constitution, as a citizen of that State.

Senator JACKSON. According to this proposal from the Department, all that power has been reserved to the Federal Government.

The only power that the State has is to serve civilian criminal process in the area and the right of the people in that area to vote has not been abridged.

That is all.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is right. He continued:

In other words, all police powers are vested in the Federal Government and for all practical purposes this area is a Territory.

Mr. President, I should like to know how a sovereign State can be a State on the one hand, and a Territory on the other hand. I should like to know how State police powers can be vested for all practical purposes in the Federal Government. Yet that is what is proposed in the bill.

Delegate BARTLETT. I have not, of course, had an opportunity to examine the amendment proposed to your committee. The amendment presented to the House committee did set up protections.

Senator CHURCH. As this amendment reads it seems to me once those withdrawals are made within the area in which the withdrawals can be made, the Federal Government has the right to exclusive jurisdiction and beyond the line that you have marked out here on the map Alaska would have in effect statehood by the sufferance of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, how can a sovereign State be sovereign at the sufferance of

the Federal Government? I submit that it undermines the entire structure of our Government to permit the President of the United States, by executive order, to deprive a State of its jurisdiction over 270,000 square miles of its territory, and to substitute therefor exclusive Federal authority.

Senator CHURCH. * * * Alaska would have in effect statehood by the sufferance of the Federal Government to the extent that the Federal Government chooses to permit it, excepting only for these rather minor reservations that are made in the amendment.

Mr. President, that is correct. But I should like to know how a sovereign State can be sovereign as a State to the extent to which the Federal Government chooses to permit it to be sovereign.

Mr. President, the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers—powers that are delegated by the States. In the field of delegated powers, the Federal Government is supreme, as we know. In the fields not delegated, the States are supreme, except for the provisions of the 10th amendment that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. President, the condition that now is attempted to be engrafted on the Constitution is an odd one, namely, that there will be statehood by the sufferance of the Federal Government, to the extent that the Federal Government chooses to permit it.

Where in the bill is State sovereignty provided for? Where does the bill provide that Alaska shall be a sovereign State? Is it possible to reach any conclusion other than that the citizens of Alaska would be second-class citizens? Is it possible to reach any conclusion other than that Alaska would be a secondary State, and would not have dignity equal to that of the other States, and would not be on the same footing with the other States, and would not have the same basis of equality that is necessary for all States under our system of government?

I read further from the hearing:

Senator CHURCH. In other words, your position is that if you can get statehood on no other basis than accepting these conditions you are willing to accept the conditions?

Delegate BARTLETT. That is true and I will tell you why. We have about 24,000 people living in these areas outside the pale. We are told that municipal corporations would continue to exist without any diminution.

Senator JACKSON. All police power will be vested in the Federal Government?

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington was correct; that is what the bill will do. But it is unheard of, under the American system of government, for there to be such a thing as Federal police power exercising State police powers.

I read further from the hearing:

Delegate BARTLETT. We were told otherwise and I hope and know you will explore that.

Senator CHURCH. I am sure we are going to have many questions to ask tomorrow of

the Government witnesses. I think perhaps in fairness to you we ought not pursue this matter too far (p. 14).

Delegate BARTLETT. I am glad we are going into this because it is, of course, vitally important. But we come before you endorsing this proposition with the understanding that the people can vote, that they can live under their city governments, under their school district governments; that the State laws in general apply, although they may be enforced thereafter if an area is withdrawn by the Federal Government.

Senator CHURCH. To what extent are you relying upon assurances in oral testimony by Government witnesses before the House committee, and to what extent are you relying on the provisions of the amendment itself which would govern?

Delegate BARTLETT. Now, both.

Senator CHURCH. For example, your statement that the State laws would apply seems to me to be based upon the assurance given by one of the witnesses before the House committee (p. 15).

Delegate BARTLETT. From my recollection, that is partly correct, Senator.

Senator CHURCH. I do not see any such assurance written in the proposal at all.

Delegate BARTLETT. My recollection is that to some extent that came about in oral testimony given.

Senator CHURCH. I am concerned that the law should provide these protections because, after all, when the time comes for the decisions to be made it will be the law that governs (p. 15).

Mr. President, I endorse in toto everything said by the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

But what are the facts of the matter? The Federal Government cannot limit the sovereignty of the State of Alaska or of any other State in this Union. But because there is an admitted attempt to do that, by means of the pending bill, the bill is beyond the Constitution of the United States.

Let us note the significance of Delegate BARTLETT's statement that this condition is acceptable to Alaskans because he himself and the other Alaskans believe that this proposed legislation would not diminish the boundaries of Alaska, and that all of Alaska as they now know it would remain the State of Alaska. Certainly the territories and boundaries would remain the same; but the authority over its citizens would be denied by section 10 and statehood would be suspended for the citizens of Alaska in the withdrawal area. State laws would not control, but Federal law would be paramount and controlling.

Mr. President, Governor Gruening, in testifying in connection with section 10, stated that the condition imposed by this section would be a precedent, and that no other State entering the Union has had such a condition imposed upon it before it could enter the Union. The Defense Department officials and other proponents of this legislation say that the authority requested by this section differs no more than the reservation contained in the act admitting Wyoming to the Union.

For the information of the Senate, I shall quote the pertinent section of the Wyoming statute, wherein jurisdiction over the Yellowstone National Park is reserved to the United States. The argument now made is that the reserva-

tion and authority sought by section 10 are no more than what were contained in the Wyoming enabling act. I now read from the Wyoming enabling act of 1890:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Wyoming have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

Sec. 2. That the said State shall consist of all the territory included within the following boundaries, to wit: Commencing at the intersection of the twenty-seventh meridian of longitude west from Washington with the forty-fifth degree of north latitude and running thence west to the thirty-fourth meridian of west longitude; thence south to the forty-first degree of north latitude; thence east to the twenty-seventh meridian of west longitude, and thence north to the place of beginning: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall repeal or affect any act of Congress relating to the Yellowstone National Park, or the reservation of the park as now defined, or as may be hereafter defined or extended, or the power of the United States over it; and nothing contained in this act shall interfere with the right and ownership of the United States in said park and reservation as it now is or may hereafter be defined or extended by law; but exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, shall be exercised by the United States, which shall have exclusive control and jurisdiction over the same; but nothing in this proviso contained shall be construed to prevent the service within said park of civil and criminal process lawfully issued by the authority of said State; and the said State shall not be entitled to select indemnity school lands for the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections that may be in said park reservation as the same is now defined or may be hereafter defined.

I submit that there is a very great difference between section 10 of the proposed Alaska statehood bill and the section of the Wyoming Act reserving jurisdiction to the United States over Yellowstone National Park. I would point out first of all that section 10, suspending statehood for certain areas in Alaska, is imposed in the legislation admitting Alaska to the Union. It is creating a condition that the people of Alaska have to consent to before the State is admitted to the Union, and clearly, to my way of thinking, a violation of the equal footing doctrine. On the other hand, the Yellowstone National Park reservation was reserved to the Federal Government while Wyoming was a Territory. Yellowstone National Park was reserved to the Federal Government in 1872, and Wyoming entered the Union in 1890. The reservation was made 18 years before the State entered the Union. Another distinction: What was the purpose of reserving the Yellowstone National Park to the United States? Was it for defense purposes? No, Mr. President. I quote the act of March 1, 1872, reserving Yellowstone National Park to the United States. Please note that this Yellowstone National Park area is reserved to the United States and withdrawn from settlement and occupancy so as to dedicate and set apart this land as a public park or pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the act of March 1, 1872, making a reservation of Yellowstone National Park while Wyoming was a Territory.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1872.

Chapter XXIV. An act to set apart a certain tract of land lying near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a public park

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land in the Territories of Montana and Wyoming, lying near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River, and described as follows, to wit, commencing at the junction of Gardiner's River with the Yellowstone River, and running east to the meridian passing 10 miles to the eastward of the most eastern point of Yellowstone Lake; thence south along said meridian to the parallel of latitude passing 10 miles south of the most southern point of Yellowstone lake; thence west along said parallel to the meridian passing 15 miles west of the most western point of Madison lake; thence north along said meridian to the latitude of the junction of the Yellowstone and Gardiner's rivers; thence east to the place of beginning, is hereby reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or sale under the laws of the United States, and dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people; and all persons who shall locate or settle upon or occupy the same, or any part thereof, except as hereinafter provided, shall be considered trespassers and removed therefrom.

SEC. 2. That said public park shall be under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Interior, whose duty it shall be, as soon as practicable, to make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the care and management of the same. Such regulations shall provide for the preservation, from injury or spoliation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition. The secretary may in his discretion, grant leases for building purposes for terms not exceeding 10 years, of small parcels of ground, at such places in said park as shall require the erection of buildings for the accommodation of visitors; all of the proceeds of said leases, and all other revenues that may be derived from any source connected with said park, to be expended under his direction in the management of the same, and the construction of roads and bridle paths therein. He shall provide against the wanton destruction of the fish and game found within said park, and against their capture or destruction for the purposes of merchandise or profit. He shall also cause all persons trespassing upon the same after the passage of this act to be removed therefrom, and generally shall be authorized to take all such measures as shall be necessary or proper to fully carry out the objects and purposes of this act.

Approved March 1, 1872.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, of course, the Supreme Court of the United States has drawn a very clear distinction. The lands in Yellowstone Park are public lands, and the Supreme Court of the United States has uniformly held that Congress has full power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States. This authorized the passage of all laws necessary to secure the rights of the United States to the public lands, and for their sale, and to protect them from taxation by the States.

But that is not the question here. The question here is the power of Congress to impose conditions on the admission of a State which would infringe on the sovereignty of such State. No such power exists in the national Congress, under every single decision of the Supreme Court of the United States from the founding of the Republic to the present day.

Now let us consider the testimony of the defense officials. They allege that this withdrawal authority is necessary for national defense purposes, not for recreational purposes, mind you, Mr. President, as in the case of Yellowstone National Park, but necessary and pertinent to the national defense, and in that connotation the power to evacuate the 24,000 residents of that withdrawn area of Alaska. In this connection, at page 106 of the hearings before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] highlighted this proposition that I am making when he said:

Senator JACKSON. Well, the Chair understands that in the past, when exclusive jurisdiction has been granted, in various national parks and in other areas, it has been for the purpose of giving to the Federal Government certain police power within the area.

Note this:

But here for the first time, I believe, we are establishing a situation where the purpose of granting this exclusive jurisdiction relates directly to a military situation, a defense situation. And I am wondering, if therefore, there isn't a little bit of a different precedent here and background of this.

So in the instant case this area is allegedly reserved to the Federal Government for national defense purposes so that the military can deal with the people and the situation in the area in a decisive and immediate way should the situation arise.

Mr. President, the proponents also state that similar authority was reserved by the Federal Government in Arizona. In Arizona, the State Legislature, after Arizona became a State, by State statute granted the right to the United States to take exclusive Federal jurisdiction over any withdrawn public lands, so that the people of Arizona were not forced to accept, as a condition precedent to admission, ceding part of its lands to the Federal Government. The action was taken by the people themselves after Arizona had entered the Union. The people of Arizona voluntarily consented to give jurisdiction over some of their land to the Federal Government after the State entered the Union. My point is that in the case of Alaska it is required to give jurisdiction over a part of its area prior to admission, whereas in the case of Arizona it was done after becoming a State and by voluntary action. Alaska, in order to get into the Union, is forced to consent to Federal jurisdiction over a part of its area as a condition of admission. Can you say, Mr. President, that Alaska is entering the Union on an equal footing with Arizona? Or that it is entering the Union on an equal footing with Idaho? Or on an equal footing with Washington?

No, Mr. President. We are here asked to do an unconstitutional act. The very basis of this Government, as I have said a number of times, is the equality of States, and is that necessary equality now in the case of Alaska, to be denied in violation of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. President, just what is the purpose of including section 10 in the bill? It is simply to enable the military to act, whether we are in a period of national emergency or not, to have full authority and power to do actions which otherwise could be done only by a declaration of martial law. Mr. Dechert, counsel for the Defense Department, in speaking to this point during the House hearings, stated that a simple proviso in the bill providing that the President could declare martial law in order to withdraw the area would be unconstitutional, in his opinion. Therefore section 10 proposes to accomplish just exactly the end result that could not be accomplished by a declaration of martial law. I think the colloquy between Representative Rogers, General Twining, and Mr. Dechert on this point is highly illuminating.

Mr. DECHERT. If I may say just a word, sir, this concept of exclusive Federal jurisdiction is, of course, not unique to Alaska.

Senator JACKSON. We have it in our State. Mr. DECHERT. In Arizona, for instance, the State legislature, after Arizona became a State, by State statute, granted the right to the United States to take exclusive Federal jurisdiction of any withdrawn public lands. The only difference between that Arizona situation and the proposal as to Alaska is that here it is proposed under section 10 that the right to take exclusive jurisdiction is to be limited to a part only of Alaska. It is a part of the initial step of Alaska becoming a State. The type of exclusive jurisdiction which can be taken in Alaska is in fact less exclusive than in the case of Arizona, because section 10 has certain exceptions written into it.

I think, sir, that there are plenty of precedents for this. For instance, in our national petroleum reserves, where exclusive jurisdiction exists, the purpose of it is a defense situation.

Senator JACKSON. But the petroleum reserve, of course—what we are doing is setting up an area that is necessary for the overall national defense requirements. Now, in the case of the oil reserve, that is simply a means of making available certain fuel to the military. But here, as I understand the request, it is to give to the military certain flexibility that they deem necessary and appropriate in connection with our defense plans. We won't go into that and discuss it here, but isn't that correct?

Of course the petroleum reserves which were under discussion are the property of the United States Government. Certainly the United States Government can handle its own property.

Mr. President, I now desire to quote from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Mr. ROGERS. I had one question I wanted to ask General Twining.

General, why would it not be just as effective if this Territory should be taken in as a State, that the Federal Government, if they wanted any of it, just declare martial law in whatever ways they want to declare it?

General TWining. We do not want to declare martial law.

Mr. DECHERT. The general asked me to speak to this.

I think, sir, that martial law can only arise in an emergency. As I understand it, under *ex parte* Milligan and cases of that kind, this withdrawal can take place in a situation which is not of that kind.

I shall discuss that case later. The case does not bear the faintest resemblance to the question at issue. That case dealt with a writ of habeas corpus, and not a question of the Federal Government withdrawing the sovereignty of a State.

I continue to quote Mr. Dechert's testimony:

It might be an insurance policy. It might be that there would be discovered up there a residual supply of the basic material of uranium which ought to be held for national defense for the future. That is nothing which would qualify the situation as one for martial law, but it might well be a reason to withdraw a certain territory for defense in the future. Therefore it is very different from the circumstances that would justify martial law.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, as the matter now stands, insofar as martial law is concerned, you would not advocate the passage of a bill of this kind with merely a proviso in there that at any time that the President saw fit, regardless of any emergency situation or regardless of the Governor's position, he could declare martial law in any section of this Territory that he wanted to. I mean, you would not want that sort of a bill as an alternative to this type of bill?

Mr. DECHERT. I have some doubts as to the constitutionality of such a bill, even if the people of Alaska consented—

I ask Senators to take particular note of this—

because I think the Supreme Court has held that you cannot declare martial law unless the circumstances warranted it to exist, and I do not believe the consent of the people of Alaska would oust the right of the Supreme Court of Alaska to pass on that subject.

Mr. President, the argument that uranium might be found and therefore it would be necessary to have a withdrawal area is not what is at issue. We are considering the claimed right of the Federal Government to suspend State sovereignty. We are considering the claimed right of the Federal Government to displace State officers and appoint Federal officers to carry on the functions of a State. We are considering the claimed right to try in the courts of the United States a man who is alleged to have violated a State statute.

Mr. President, I continue the quotation:

Mr. ROGERS. I appreciate that, but I have come to the conclusion, sir, that the constitutionality of some of these things depend on what the Supreme Court happens to think it is the day they sit. We have had a few conflicts on that particular item. But, as I understand it, one of the main reasons that you want this type of bill is because you might want to withdraw some section or some particular part of this area on more or less a permanent basis.

Mr. DECHERT. No, sir. I think that is not true, sir. I think, as I started to say at one time this morning on behalf of the Defense Department, that this insurance pol-

icy is of two natures. The insurance policy exists in the power of withdrawal—withdrawal not for martial law purposes, but withdrawal of exclusive legislative jurisdiction. But in addition, the active withdrawal may be an insurance policy itself.

Who ever heard of the Federal Government having to withdraw from a State exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the State?

I read further from Mr. Dechert's testimony:

In other words, the President may determine that he sees no immediate emergency or threat of war today, but in the overall interests of the defense of the country, he ought to take the step of establishing this as a defense area.

I tried to point out this morning—I am glad to have the opportunity now—that even if the President should act tomorrow, it would not necessarily mean that he sees the threat of immediate warfare. He is acting because in his overall responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the Army, he sees a need to establish a national defense exclusive jurisdiction. What reason may exist, only the future can tell.

That is the road to dictatorship. If the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, can overturn a State without a declaration of martial law, when it is admitted that the conditions which would give him the right to declare martial law do not exist, he can declare a State to be an exclusive national defense area, kick out local officials, prevent the legislature of a State from enacting laws, try people in the Federal courts, and rule the State through the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the long and the short of this matter is that under any concept of the law the Government cannot withdraw from the States property and remove its people without the consent of the State involved unless there is a state of war in existence or a declaration of martial law. This is "equal footing." As to Alaska, the bill attempts to accomplish the end before the fact and places Alaska in the position that, unlike any other State, she must submit to a withdrawal without her consent, in the absence of a state of war, and without the declaration of martial law. This is not "equal footing." Over one-half of the proposed State of Alaska is thus neither fish nor fowl. Over one-half of the State of Alaska belongs to the State until the President shall determine that it does not. Then it belongs to the Federal Government for as long as the President shall deem, in his discretion, that it should—be it a day, a month, or for eternity.

Why does not the bill completely exclude the area involved in section 10 from statehood or, if it is to be included, why not let the new State of Alaska give its consent after statehood, as was done in the case of Arizona?

The reason lies in the desire of the proponents of this legislation to bypass the new State and prevent the citizens of that State from exercising the right to grant consent after admission into the Union.

I have read a part of the testimony as recorded in the printed record of the hearings. At a later time during the debate I shall quote further from the testi-

mony, to illustrate that the price to be exacted of the people of Alaska as a condition to entering the Union violates the Constitution of the United States.

There is another ground. At the proper time I shall raise the point of order as to the constitutionality of another section of the bill.

It is proposed to ratify the constitution of Alaska. The Judiciary Committee, which historically has considered constitutions of States, has been bypassed. I submit that the method outlined in the proposed constitution of Alaska for the election of United States Senators is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The last clause of section 1 of Senate bill 49 and House bill 7999 confirms, ratifies, and accepts the constitution previously approved by the residents of the Territory of Alaska.

One of the provisions of this constitution directly violates a provision of the Constitution of the United States. I refer to section 8 of article XV, which attempts to provide for the election of one United States Senator for a short term and the election of one United States Senator for a long term. The exact language of section 8 of the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Alaska reads as follows:

8. The officers to be elected at the first general election shall include two Senators and 1 Representative to serve in the Congress of the United States, unless Senators and a Representative have been previously elected and seated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How can any Territory elect Members of the Senate or House if it is not a State? What would be the position of the two individuals—and I would have no objection to either of them—if the bill should pass? Under the law could they take the oath of office?

Mr. EASTLAND. In one case—the State of Tennessee elected Senators. Later she was admitted to the Union.

The Constitution provides that each State shall elect two Senators, who shall serve for a term of 6 years. When they come to the Senate—and that has been the situation from 1787 until the present time; it was the situation when New Mexico was admitted, and when Arizona was admitted—the Senate provides that they shall draw lots for the short term and the long term. Senators are classified into three classes. If a Senator draws a lot good for 2 years, he serves for 2 years. If he draws a lot good for 6 years, he serves 6 years. But the two Senators cannot both come up for election the same year.

In this case an attempt is made to bypass the right of the United States Senate and provide that Alaska shall elect one Senator for the short term and one for the long term, when it is the prerogative of the Senate to specify the term.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Neither New Mexico nor Arizona elected its Senators under the Constitution until after it was admitted.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the only way they can qualify, of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Without having looked into the legal aspects, I doubt whether any Territory while it is still a Territory can say, "These are going to be our Senators."

Mr. EASTLAND. It cannot qualify them but it may be able to elect them, as in the Tennessee case. The distinguished Senator is exactly correct in the final analysis.

Section 8 of the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Alaska is as follows:

The officers to be elected at the first general election shall include two Senators and one Representative to serve in the Congress of the United States, unless Senators and a Representative have been previously elected and seated. One Senator shall be elected for the long term and one Senator for the short term, each term to expire on the third day of January of the following year, and be determined by authority of the United States. The term of the Representative shall expire on the third day of January in the odd-numbered year immediately following his assuming office. If the first Representative is elected in an even numbered year to take office in that year, a Representative shall be elected at the same time to fill the full term commencing on the third day of January of the following year, and the same person may be elected for both terms.

The Constitution of the United States provides in the first Article that the Senate of the United States shall be composed of Senators chosen for 6 years.

Any attempt to elect a Senator for what is called a "short term" is clearly in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. This is no idle matter.

Even if it is considered to be only an attempt by the Alaska Constitutional Convention to designate that one Senator from the proposed new State of Alaska shall belong to one class and the other Senator shall belong to another class of Senators, it is equally beyond the authority of any State to make such a designation.

Mr. President, no one of my colleagues needs to do any more to satisfy himself on this point than to pick up the admirable new volume, entitled "Senate Procedure: Precedents and Practices" by our distinguished Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian, Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick, and turn to page 553 of that work, to the section captioned "Senators," and examine the paragraph on "Senators—Classification of" and read the simple, direct, and unequivocal statement as follows:

The legislature of a new State has no authority to designate the particular class to which Senators first elected shall be assigned.

This statement, we may be sure, is amply supported by the precedents.

Indeed, all of us are aware, there are not two, but three classes of Senators and the terms of one-third of this body expire at 2-year intervals.

It cannot be said, until the classification of new Senators is accomplished, whether, indeed, a new Senator is to be assigned to class 1, class 2, or class 3.

In any event, any attempt to elect a Senator for a short term is in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States; and any attempt on the part of a proposed new State to determine in advance the classifications to be assigned to its two new Senators, is in direct violation of the practice which has been followed without exception in regard to the classification of Senators from new States from the time of the organization of this Republic.

There have been at least two previous instances in which there has been an attempt made to designate the classification of Senators. In both those instances, however, no attempt was made to designate that classification by a proposed constitutional provision or even by legislation. As a matter of fact, it was done by resolutions accompanying the certificates of election. In both cases, the Senators themselves were actually elected for a six-year term.

The first instance to which I refer occurred when the new State of Minnesota was admitted to the Union. In the Journal of the Senate for Wednesday, May 12, 1858—Journal, page 441—there appears the following:

Mr. Toombs presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in joint convention, in favor of the Hon. Henry M. Rice, representing that State in the Senate of the United States for the long term; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

At that time, Mr. Toombs remarked, as reported in the Congressional Globe:

Mr. TOOMBS. The Legislature of the State of Minnesota in the joint convention which elected Senators passed a resolution on the subject of their tenure. It is a question of some trouble and difficulty, and I move that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That is where the pending bill should be sent, to the Committee on the Judiciary. If it were sent there, it would not have so many holes in it.

I digress at this point to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Minnesota case the matter of tenure of Senators was recognized as the business and jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think it still is and that any legislation, proposed constitution, or resolution dealing with the tenure and classification of Senators should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate.

Continuing with the procedure in regard to Minnesota, 2 days later, Mr. Bayard from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution of the State of Minnesota, filed the Committee's report to the Senate. The Committee on the Judiciary reported a resolution setting forth the procedure for classifying the two new Senators from Minnesota in precisely the same manner in which the Senators from new States had been classified by the Senate of the United States, without exception, from the first session of the First Congress.

The Committee on the Judiciary in that instance recommended as follows:

"Resolved, That the Senate proceed to ascertain the classes in which the Senators

from the State of Minnesota shall be inserted, in conformity with the resolution of the 14th of May 1789, and as the Constitution requires."

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. BAYARD. Now I ask that the order accompanying the resolution from the committee be read and considered.

The Secretary read it, as follows:

"Ordered, That the Secretary put into the ballot box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered one, and the other shall be a blank. Each of the Senators of the State of Minnesota shall draw out one paper, and the Senator who shall draw the paper numbered one shall be inserted in the class of Senators whose term of service will expire on the 3d of March 1859; that the Secretary shall then put into the ballot box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered two and the other shall be numbered three. The other Senator shall draw out one paper. If the paper drawn be numbered two, the Senator shall be inserted in the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire on the 3d day of March 1861; and if the paper drawn be numbered three, the Senator shall be inserted in the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 3d day of March 1863."

The claimed right of the State of Minnesota was denied by the Senate. It is the business of the Senate, under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Bayard's comments upon the resolution on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary laid the question to rest with clarity beyond question in his following remarks:

Mr. BAYARD. I will merely state, on behalf of the committee, that the request made by the Legislature of Minnesota—it is but a request—is entirely inconsistent with the settled practice of the Government under the resolution of the Senate in 1789, when the Senate was first organized. The committee has seen no reason for changing that practice. The Senate had then to determine how they would classify Senators, and they have always adhered to the practice then adopted. The Constitution of the United States authorizes the election of Senators for 6 years, and provides for their classification. In the first instance, in organizing the Senate, they might do it in one of two modes—either by lot or by arbitrary determination. They decided that lot was the best mode to do it; and thus the term is determined on the first coming in of a Senator; and that has been the mode of proceeding since the first origin of the Government.

The following year the State of Oregon was admitted to the Union, and the two Senators from the new State of Oregon were classified in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and the long-established customs of the Senate. The matter raised by the resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota had been effectively settled.

The other case to which I should like to advert is the case of the State of North Dakota, when the credentials of the two Senators from that new State were presented. On December 4, 1889, the credentials of the two Senators from the new State of North Dakota were presented to the Senate. The Vice President directed the reading of a resolution reported by the Committee on Privileges and Elections which set forth the time-honored procedure of classification of Senators in this body. After that resolution was read, Senator Cullom,

who had presented the credentials of the two new Senators, addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, before action is taken upon the resolution just read, I desire to present some resolutions adopted by the two houses of the Legislature of North Dakota touching upon the question of the term of one of the Senators from that State. I ask to have them read by the Secretary so that they may be placed upon record.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SENATE CHAMBER,
Bismarck, N. Dak., November 29, 1889.

It is herewith certified that on Wednesday, the 20th day of November, A. D. 1889, and subsequent to the election of Hon. Gilbert A. Pierce as Senator in the Congress of the United States, the senate of the first session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Hon. Gilbert A. Pierce, the unanimous choice of the Republican senators of the State of North Dakota, has been chosen, by vote of the senate, one of the United States Senators to represent said State in the Congress of the United States: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That he be, and is hereby, designated to represent the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States for the long term."

We have the identical proposition in the bill before us.

Said resolution being recorded on page 2 of the Senate Journal of November 20, 1889.

ALFRED DICKEY,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Senator Hoar, one of the most distinguished men ever to sit in the Senate, then addressed the Senate and spoke as follows:

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States provides that after the assembling of the Senate, in consequence of the first election, "they (the Senators) shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes." The Constitution does not expressly provide by what authority that designation should be made, but it has been the uninterrupted usage since the Government was inaugurated for the Senate to exercise that authority. Indeed, no other authority could be for a moment supposed to have been intended to be charged with this duty.

The Legislature of the State of North Dakota, the two houses of that legislature, after the election, have expressed a desire that one of the two gentlemen elected to the Senate of the United States from that State should hold the seat for the long term. Of course, that matter did not enter into the election there, and if it had done so, it is obvious that the State legislature had no constitutional authority in relation to the subject. Indeed, it was not then known, and is not yet known, what length of term will be assigned to either of the Senators from that State. Either of them may, in accordance with the lot, be assigned to the 6 years', the 4 years' or the 2 years' term. All that the Senate now knows is that, if this resolution be adopted, no two Senators will be assigned, from any one of the States that have just been admitted, to a term of the same length. Perhaps the desire of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota may be accomplished as the result of the proceedings of the Senate, but that must be the result of the lot, and I cannot see that the Senate may justly or properly exercise any authority in regard to it by way of departure from its duty.

That is the request in this case, that the United States Senate depart from a duty and let Alaska specify one Senator for the short term and one for the long term.

Mr. President, the statement of Senator Hoar is but recognition of what was then and is now an inescapable conclusion; namely that the State legislature has no constitutional authority in relation to this subject; that it has been the uninterrupted usage, since the Government was inaugurated, for the Senate itself to exercise this authority, and that no other authority can properly be considered. Yet, Mr. President, 100 years after this matter has been discussed and has been settled, the proposed State of Alaska, through its proposed Constitution, again wants to renew the discussions and the debates on this subject. It is absolutely clear in my mind that this provision of the proposed constitution for the State of Alaska lacks authority in law and violates the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I desire to make the point that there has been either a lack of understanding of the structure of the Senate in the drafting of this provision or, if it was known, then it has been completely ignored.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to go into this subject quite carefully in order that the Senate shall know that there are errors of major importance with the legislation now pending relating to the admission of Alaska to statehood. In my opinion, in view of the errors and inconsistencies which have been made in relation to the classification and tenure of Senators, the probability is there are others. I find nowhere in the reports or the hearings on this matter where these questions I pose have ever been raised or resolved, and I do not believe that the Senate could approve this constitution or the legislation until there has been a great deal more study given to many of its phases. Let me point out again that House Report No. 624 to accompany H. R. 7999, on page 5 thereof, states as follows:

By enactment of H. R. 7999 this Constitution will be accepted, ratified and confirmed by the Congress of the United States.

That is what we are asked to do—to accept, ratify, and confirm a constitution which violates the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe Senators should vote for the acceptance, ratification or confirmation of a constitution which contains a provision which does violence to such a basic concept of this body as its method of classification for purposes of tenure. So, there can be no doubt as to what the proposed constitution for the new State of Alaska provides in this respect. Let me again set forth that provision.

Section 8 of article XV reads:

The officers to be elected at the first general election shall include two Senators and one Representative to serve in the Congress of the United States, unless Senators and Representatives have been previously elected and seated. One Senator shall be elected for the long term and one Senator for the short term, each term to expire on the third day of January in an odd-numbered year to be determined by authority of the United States. The term of the Representative

shall expire on the third day of January in the odd-numbered year immediately following his assuming office. If the first Representative is elected in an even-numbered year to take office in that year, a Representative shall be elected at the same time to fill the full term commencing on the third day of January of the following year, and the same person may be elected for both terms.

The proposal which this body, in its approval of H. R. 7999, would be ratifying, accepting, and confirming is, on its face, completely inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, which requires that Senators be chosen for a term of 6 years and which further requires that the Senate divide itself into three classes. What is proposed in the case of Alaska has never been done in the history of the United States, and should not be done now.

Mr. President, on this ground, and on the ground that we would be denying full sovereignty and equality to a State, something which we have no authority to do, I think the point of order I shall raise at the proper time should be sustained.

I certainly think that before final action is taken on the bill, and the constitution of Alaska ratified, the matter should go to the Committee on the Judiciary for study. In the bill it is proposed even to set up a Federal court system. If the bill were enacted, we should be tampering with the immigration laws, which are exclusively matters for the Committee on the Judiciary. We should be setting the boundaries of a State, when the Reorganization Act gives to the Committee on the Judiciary the exclusive jurisdiction over setting the boundaries of States and Territories.

For these reasons, and for others which I shall outline later, I am opposed to the bill. I think the point of order should be sustained; and, if not sustained, that the bill should be defeated.

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. EASTLAND's speech,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arizona with the same understanding as when I have previously yielded to other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make some brief comments on the bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The total sum appropriated is \$577,904,113. This amount is \$11,380,898 under the total budget estimates, \$7,181,500 over the House bill, \$10,813,000 below the Senate recommendation, and \$3,494,243 more than the 1958 total appropriations.

To mention the action taken on some of the major items, \$101,750,000 was agreed to for salaries and expenses of the State Department and the Foreign Serv-

ice. This figure is \$3,286,500 more than this year's allowance, and we trust that it will be sufficient to provide a well balanced program for the various activities paid for from this appropriation, including the expansion of services in needed critical areas of the world.

Twenty-two million eight hundred thousand dollars was allowed for the exchange program. This is an increase of \$2 million over the House allowance, and \$8 million under the Senate proposal. This added sum has been earmarked for expansion of the Latin American exchange program. The conferees stipulated in their report that not less than \$4,623,775 of the total appropriation shall be spent in the Latin American area in fiscal 1959.

For salaries and expenses of the United States Information Agency the conferees agreed to the figure of \$98,500,000, or an increase of \$1,500,000 above the House allowance and a decrease of \$1,500,000 be-

low the Senate recommendation. This should enable the Agency to expand certain of its missions and mediums programs in areas where they are most critical, as the sum recommended is \$3,400,000 above the current year's appropriation.

For the President's special international program a total of \$6,410,500 was agreed to. This sum is a split between the amount recommended by the House and proposed by the Senate. As Members know, this appropriation is to provide funds for the cultural and sports presentations under the Department of State and for the trade fair program operated by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a summary statement of the bill.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of bill

Appropriation	Appropriations (adjusted), 1958	Estimates, 1959	House bill, 1959	Senate recommendations, 1959	Conference action
State.....	\$203,277,306	\$199,990,151	\$192,859,353	\$205,955,853	\$197,103,353
Justice.....	227,205,000	230,190,000	229,410,000	230,317,000	230,317,000
The Judiciary.....	39,571,050	41,472,860	40,703,260	40,878,260	40,823,260
United States Information Agency.....	96,200,000	110,032,000	101,750,000	104,750,000	103,250,000
Funds appropriated to the President.....	15,145,000	7,600,000	6,000,000	6,821,000	6,410,500
Total.....	581,398,356	589,285,011	570,722,613	588,717,113	577,904,113

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1958	Estimates, 1959	Recommended in House bill for 1959	Amount recommended by Senate	
Administration of foreign affairs:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$98,463,500	\$105,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$102,000,000	\$101,750,000
Representation allowances.....	600,000	1,000,000	650,000	1,000,000	750,000
Acquisition of buildings abroad.....	18,500,000	18,500,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Payment to Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.....	1,667,000	2,025,000	2,025,000	2,025,000	2,025,000
Extension and remodeling, State Department Building.....	2,500,000				
Total, administration of foreign affairs.....	122,730,500	127,525,000	121,675,000	124,025,000	123,525,000
International organizations and conferences:					
Contributions to international organizations.....	45,589,806	41,889,151	41,827,453	41,827,453	41,827,453
Missions to international organizations.....	1,357,500	1,700,000	1,646,000	1,692,500	1,690,000
International contingencies.....	1,750,000	2,400,000	1,800,000	1,950,000	1,600,000
11th World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization.....	332,500				
Total, international organizations and conferences.....	49,029,806	45,989,151	44,973,453	45,469,953	45,117,453
International commissions:					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	505,000	505,000	505,000	505,000	505,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,533,000	1,570,000	1,570,000	1,570,000	1,570,000
Construction.....	300,000	1,000,000	750,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
American sections, international commissions.....	330,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Passamaquoddy tidal power survey.....	1,344,000	616,000	616,000	616,000	616,000
International fisheries commissions.....	1,680,000	1,660,000	1,644,900	1,644,900	1,644,900
Total, international commissions.....	5,692,000	5,676,000	5,410,900	5,660,900	5,660,900
Educational exchange:					
International educational exchange activities.....	20,800,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	30,800,000	22,800,000
Educational, scientific, and cultural activities.....	3,525,000				
Total, educational exchange.....	24,325,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	30,800,000	22,800,000
Rama Road: Rama Road.....	1,500,000				
Total, Department of State.....	203,277,306	199,990,151	192,859,353	205,955,853	197,103,353

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:					
General administration, salaries and expenses.....	\$3,250,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,250,000	\$3,250,000	\$3,250,000
General legal activities, salaries and expenses.....	10,800,000	11,350,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses.....	3,785,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses.....	20,150,000	20,430,000	20,350,000	20,350,000	20,350,000
Special temporary attorneys and assistants.....	150,000				
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses.....	220,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Total, legal activities and general administration.....	40,155,000	40,790,000	40,510,000	40,510,000	40,510,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses.....	101,450,000	102,500,000	102,500,000	102,500,000	102,500,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses.....	49,600,000	49,600,000	49,500,000	49,500,000	49,500,000

Summary of bill—Continued
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1958	Estimates, 1959	Recommended in House bill for 1959	Amount recom- mended by Senate	
Federal Prison System:					
Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses.....	\$32,200,000	\$33,000,000	\$32,800,000	\$33,707,000	\$33,707,000
Buildings and facilities.....	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Support of United States prisoners.....	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Total, Federal Prison System.....	36,000,000	37,300,000	36,900,000	37,807,000	37,807,000
Office of Alien Property: Salaries and expenses.....	(2,935,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)
Total, Department of Justice.....	227,205,000	230,190,000	229,410,000	230,317,000	230,317,000

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:					
Salaries.....	\$1,238,000	\$1,249,000	\$1,249,000	\$1,249,000	\$1,249,000
Printing and binding, Supreme Court reports.....	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Miscellaneous expenses.....	62,500	74,500	74,500	74,500	74,500
Care of the building and grounds.....	218,200	317,000	284,000	284,000	284,000
Automobile for the Chief Justice.....	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835
Total, Supreme Court.....	1,614,535	1,736,335	1,703,335	1,703,335	1,703,335
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses.....	307,000	308,450	308,450	308,450	308,450
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses.....	677,010	699,620	699,620	699,620	699,620
Court of Claims:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$10,855	\$12,655	\$12,655	\$12,655	\$12,655
Repairs and improvements.....	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Total, Court of Claims.....	19,855	21,655	21,655	21,655	21,655
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:					
Salaries of judges.....	9,075,000	9,358,500	9,358,500	9,358,500	9,358,500
Salaries of supporting personnel.....	18,473,200	19,291,000	19,011,700	19,011,700	19,011,700
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	4,025,000	5,058,000	4,925,000	4,995,000	4,995,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	2,839,000	3,098,300	2,950,000	3,000,000	2,975,000
Administrative Office, salaries and expenses.....	840,450	1,101,000	925,000	975,000	950,000
Referees, special account:					
Salaries.....	(1,755,000)	(2,034,700)	(2,006,500)	(2,006,500)	(2,006,500)
Expenses.....	(2,345,700)	(2,635,800)	(2,625,550)	(2,625,550)	(2,625,550)
Total, other courts and services.....	36,152,650	37,906,800	37,170,200	37,340,200	37,290,200
Total, the judiciary.....	39,571,050	41,472,800	40,703,260	40,873,260	40,823,260

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses.....	\$95,100,000	\$105,000,000	\$97,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$98,500,000
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities.....	1,100,000	5,032,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Total, United States Information Agency.....	96,200,000	110,032,000	101,750,000	104,750,000	103,250,000

TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

President's special international program.....	\$15,145,000	\$7,600,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,821,000	\$6,410,500
--	--------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

TITLE VI—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

Corporation	Authorization, 1958	Estimate, 1959	Recommended in House bill for 1959	Amount recommended by Senate	
Department of Justice: Federal Prison Industries, Inc.....	(\$1,000,000)	(\$1,067,000)	(\$1,067,000)	(\$1,067,000)	(\$1,067,000)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that the conferees on House bill 12428 agreed to accept a proviso inserted by the Senate, to the effect that Senate members of delegations to annual conferences of the Inter-Parliamentary Union are to be selected by the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I am delighted that the conferees accepted this provision.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee would agree with me that to enable Senate members of the delegation to discharge fully their responsibilities to the Senate and to the American people, they might wish this year to utilize the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and the secretary to the minority for administrative purposes, in connection

with Senate participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

I wonder also if the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations would agree with me that our participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union conferences has become so important that Senate delegates should make use of the professional staff members of appropriate Senate committees for assistance in connection with foreign policy discussions at those conferences.

Mr. HAYDEN. To me it seems perfectly practicable, and a sound way to proceed, to utilize the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and the secretary to the minority in connection with the conferences of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

So far as using the staff members of Senate committees is concerned, that, too, is entirely practicable. It is only

good business to handle the situation in that way. I entirely approve of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I think this legislative history should be made, and that it should prove its worth in the years to come.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the Senator explain to us why the Senate receded in connection with the \$8 million for international educational exchange?

Mr. HAYDEN. On that item we could not obtain any other kind of agreement with the House conferees.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator also be kind enough to tell me whether the House Members assigned any reason for wishing to reduce the sum?

Mr. HAYDEN. They insisted that they had allowed \$20.8 million, the full

amount requested by the Budget Bureau for this year. We pointed out that last year the Bureau of the Budget asked for \$30 million for this purpose. This year the total approved by the conference action is \$22,800,000. In other words, we persuaded the House to increase by \$2,800,000 the amount it had approved. That was the compromise which was made.

Mr. JAVITS. Without intending any criticism whatever, I consider such a policy to be very shortsighted. I know of nothing which contributes more greatly to an orientation of leadership in the world, in terms of the objectives of the United States in the Free World, than the educational exchange program.

I am very glad the Senator has pinpointed—as he always does so accurately—where our problem lies. I gather that it lies with the Budget Bureau. I shall do my utmost, as one Senator, to bring the Bureau of the Budget around to a much more ample outlook on this subject. This kind of neglect embarrasses us very much in connection with many of the things we wish to do in the field of foreign policy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator advise me what the conferees did with respect to the representation allowance for State Department employees?

Mr. HAYDEN. The conferees allowed \$750,000.

Mr. CLARK. It is my recollection that the amount in the Senate version of the bill was \$1 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is correct. We had to split the difference, so to speak.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that the House recommended \$600,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. It recommended \$650,000.

Mr. CLARK. I am aware of the difficulties which the distinguished Senator from Arizona and his colleagues encounter every year with regard to that item. However, I am not in the slightest degree critical when I point out that the amount requested by the Secretary of State, namely, \$1 million, was, in my judgment, inadequate. The amount granted by the Senate was as much as the Secretary of State requested, which was about all the Senate could do. I express my keen disappointment that our friends in the other body do not yet seem to appreciate the serious disadvantages under which they place our representatives abroad when they take the point of view which they take with respect to representation allowances.

I congratulate the Senator from Arizona on at least having succeeded in raising the amount a little. I hope that next year the State Department will come forward with an initial request which will be more realistic, and that sooner or later we can eliminate this lag in our foreign policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to have the RECORD show that I did not fully approve the conference report. The

chairman will recall that when the question was reached, I would not agree to the amount insisted upon by the House conferees for the educational exchange program, which was \$2 million instead of \$10 million. In practically every other case of a difference in the various items the House conferees agreed to split the difference. In this case, however, they would agree to allow only \$2 million as against the \$10 million allowed by the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I take it the Senator has no objection to the remainder of the conference report, but he does object to this particular item.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I strenuously object to the exchange-program item. I have some comments with respect to 1 or 2 other items. I think the Senate is entitled to more consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I accurately recollect what the Senator had to say during the conference, he made that perfectly clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want the RECORD to show also, with respect to the question of the budget request, that, as the Senator from Arizona has said, last year the budget allowed \$30 million for this program. The House of Representatives reduced the amount to \$17,500,000. The Senate allowed the full \$30 million, and in conference we got \$20,800,000.

This year, when I took the question up with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, he said, "We are operating under ceilings. Since you were able to get only \$20,800,000 last year, we cannot afford to recommend the difference between that and \$30 million. We have no reason to believe that you can persuade the House to allow you any more." In fact, there was reason to believe that that was not possible, because of the attitude of the House in the past. Because of a position of expediency, we could not obtain an allowance of more than \$20,800,000. When the House insists that it cannot make an allowance which is above the budget figure, I think that is an argument without real substance.

Only last week, in the case of military appropriations, the House allowed more than \$200 million above the budget.

This morning's press carried an item to the effect that the construction account for the AEC was doubled. An additional \$186 million was allowed.

It is nonsense to say that the House is held down by a budget ceiling, especially in view of the fact that more was allowed for this purpose in last year's budget.

I think it is an extremely wasteful and extravagant way to proceed, for the House to insist upon spending money to meet a situation which does not exist in the international field.

The evidence before the Foreign Relations Committee has been very clear, and anyone who reads the newspapers can see, that the threat today is not primarily from military attack, but from infiltration and subversion of the Middle East, Latin America, and southeast Asia. It is extremely extravagant and wasteful of the public funds to appropriate money to meet an emergency which is not urgent.

Diverting the money of the public to the military and the AEC, under present conditions in the world, in my opinion is very wasteful, and shows very poor understanding of world conditions. However, I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee. I hope he does not take what I say as criticism of him. He has done everything he could to maintain the appropriations for the State Department, and especially for the exchange program.

I wish to remind the Senate and the people of the country that our State Department is our first line of defense in the nonmilitary field. The officials of the State Department are the ones who, if it is possible to avoid war, must bear the burden of doing that. It is their task. Yet the House quibbles over \$100,000 in appropriations for representation expenses. To me it is absolutely fantastic that they would be so adamant in their position. The Senate conferees offered to compromise the figure at \$850,000, which would have more nearly split the difference between the two Houses. No; they would not do that. They would agree to appropriate only \$750,000. That is certainly a very shortsighted attitude to take. The total appropriation is approximately the amount by which the budget for military items was increased. Nevertheless, the House Members quarrel over a small item of \$100,000. It is small in proportion to the entire amount involved.

I believe that if we do not exercise greater discrimination, evince a better sense of perspective, and have a better idea of how to appropriate our means than is indicated by action on this bill, we do not deserve to prosper; and we are not prospering, as evidenced by the recent outbreaks in Latin America and in the Middle East. It is disastrous to be so parsimonious with the State Department on such a small item and at the same time to be so lavish with the military. I do not believe it is wise at all. In fact, it is disastrous. It could very well lead to a sense of defeatism on the part of officers of the State Department who represent us all over the world. I do not approve of the overall lack of perspective shown by the House on nonmilitary items.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Arkansas has said. I feel exactly as he does with respect to the action the other body took in forcing down the appropriation for the State Department. It is one of the most important fields of our national security. It is about time we realized it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Pennsylvania have said. What they have stated is absolutely true. The reason for my rising—and I believe this is also true of the Senator from Pennsylvania and I hope other Senators will do the same—is that it will help back up the Senator from Arkansas, who would like to have the country speak on this subject. The country will speak only if we give some leadership and tongue to the inarticulate feeling of

many millions of people in the United States. I am grateful to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to comment on what the Senator from New York said earlier about pinpointing the matter. It is true that a part of the trouble lies with the Bureau of the Budget. However, we can well see what occurs in the House. As a matter of fact, I believe the Bureau of the Budget was much more sympathetic this year than it was last year. However, if we read the hearings before the House committee, we can readily realize the attitude of many of the Members of the House with respect to the State Department. That attitude is inexcusable, in my opinion. It is an attitude which criticizes, for example, the teaching of French in an institution which the State Department has established in a building which we already own in southern France.

The attitude of the Members of the House is expressed in the ridicule which they heap upon those who are trying to improve the quality of our Foreign Service. One can read it in the House hearings. We can read in the hearings how the representatives of the State Department are ridiculed. They are called people in the striped pants and—

Mr. JAVITS. Striped pants, and cookie pushers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Striped pants, and cookie pushers, and such criticism. I do not say that all the people in the State Department are perfect. However, they are criticized when they are trying to improve their service. When we consider the overall appropriations which have been made for the other activities, such as those of the Atomic Energy Commission and the military, the appropriation for the State Department is all out of proportion. The Atomic Energy Commission has its appropriation increased in an amount, for construction alone, which is almost as large as the whole appropriation for the State Department. There is no sense of proportion used at all. If we were going broke and were not appropriating money for any activity, I would not mind, but here we are throwing money around for all sorts of activities which are not so important as those of the State Department. It is a disastrous policy to follow.

Mr. JAVITS. I have served in the House, and I believe there is a misconception of the American people's ideas about the State Department and those who work for it. It may have been true in another day, when most of the American people thought that jobs with the State Department were lush jobs for socially well-placed individuals. Today they realize it is a question of survival, and a question of life or death; and perish the day when we have to require military expenditures instead of appropriations for activities of the State Department in our effort to maintain peace in the world.

I would also ask the Senator from Arkansas, who is a student of our foreign relations and stands high in the Committee on Foreign Relations, to keep up his fight. I hope very much that

more of our colleagues will join him. After all, it is the people who will ultimately decide, and they can do a great deal more with the other body than many of us can.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12428, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

June 25, 1958.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 12, and 16 to the bill (H. R. 12428) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$650,000" named in said amendment, insert: "\$300,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

GRAY REEF DAM AND RESERVOIR

During the delivery of Mr. EASTLAND's speech,

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, on the same conditions under which I have heretofore yielded, so that he may call up a noncontroversial bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 4002.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4002) to authorize the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir as part of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and myself, for the purpose of authorizing a modification of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The purpose of the bill is to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to construct Gray Reef Dam at an estimated cost of not to exceed \$700,000.

This is a noncontroversial bill. It was unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and was reported to the Senate.

I have cleared this matter with the leadership on the Democratic side, and

I understand that my colleague has cleared it with the leadership on the Republican side.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me, let me say that I have cleared the bill with the leadership on this side of the aisle.

Furthermore, I may say that the bill is extremely important from an emergency standpoint, because the Bureau of Reclamation is very anxious to construct the afterbay, which is the Gray Reef Dam, at the same time that it completes construction of the Fremont Canyon powerplant.

So it is very important that this authorization be made, so the funds will be available for construction this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This project is for the stabilization of the flow of the river, and it serves all the end uses of the flow of the stream.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4002) to authorize the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir as a part of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, at the end of the bill, following the word "act", to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no construction shall proceed until a feasibility report has been submitted and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4002) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project, as authorized by the joint resolution of July 16, 1954 (68 Stat. 486), is modified to provide for the construction and operation of the small reregulating Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River downstream from Alcova Dam at an estimated cost of \$700,000.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no construction shall proceed until a feasibility report has been submitted and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these proceedings be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3910) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8054) to provide for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in lands beneath inland navigable waters in the Territory of Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12088) extending the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Charles Marion Russell, presented by the State of Montana, to be placed in Statuary Hall;

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of Charles Marion Russell, and to hold ceremonies on said occasion; and

S. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing the correction of an error in the enrollment of S. 2533, amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, etc.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the compelling reason for the admission of Alaska to statehood is that it affords the United States a perfect opportunity to demonstrate that we practice what we preach.

For decades we have preached democracy to the rest of the world. Yet we have denied full self-government to our vast outpost in the North, despite many assurances that such would not continue to be the case. I believe it was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said:

What you are stands over you the while, and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary.

The Voice of America may talk of democracy, but its message will ring hollowly through the rest of the Free World if America fails to practice democracy. In the crucible of world opinion, we shall be tested by deeds and not words. Statehood for Alaska will be a tangible deed. In this way we can give vitality, meaning, and truth to our words about freedom.

We could debate for many weeks whether Alaska has the population, resources, and economic strength to justify statehood. This is a debatable topic. From long experience in Alaska personally—both as a civilian and in Army uniform—I believe Alaska qualifies for statehood in these essentials. Yet I am willing to concede that another side can be ventured with respect to such measurements.

But, when self-government is the issue, I refuse to admit two sides or two arguments. Either we practice democracy or we deny it. Alaska has been an American possession since 1867, when we acquired it from Czar Alexander II of Imperial Russia. That is nearly a century. Yet no resident of Alaska ever has cast a ballot for President of the United States, for an elected governor, for a local legislator qualified to enact sovereign laws, or for a person accredited to answer rollcalls conducted by the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

PRACTICE OF DEMOCRACY

What does this incontrovertible fact do to our preachments over the Voice of America about democracy? Does it make them valid to our friends in the rest of the Free World or does it repudiate and ridicule them? Answer this question for yourselves.

I can remember being bivouacked on the great river of the North, the majestic Yukon, in the neighboring Yukon Territory of Canada. My companion was a valiant and famous officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the late Col. Denny La Nauze.

He was a man of wisdom, education, and a sense of humor. He and I were warm friends.

"Dick," said he to me, "you Americans are great chaps but you often give me a merry chuckle. You lecture to us of the British Empire about self-government and about freeing our colonies and about self-determination of peoples. Your lectures are very inspiring. Yet your 200,000 folks in Alaska don't have self-government. By contrast, our 15,000 or 20,000 folks in the Yukon have full voting representation in our Parliament at Ottawa and thus participate totally in the selection of a Prime Minister and his governing cabinet. What do you have to say about that?"

I looked at my friend in the Royal Mounted, with the last rays of the Arctic sunlight glistening on the brass buttons and badges of his spectacular uniform; and—although my acquaintances may find this difficult to believe—I had very little to say in rebuttal or reply. After all, what could I say?

A CONTRACT WITH CANADA

Canada, which is part of the British Empire, gives full participation in its Dominion Government to the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, who are Alaska's neighbors along the roof of the hemisphere. But we have accorded no comparable privilege to Alaska, so far as our own Federal Government is concerned. What do we have to say for ourselves, in the face of world opinion, when we boast of our vaunted

democracy? If Alaska is denied statehood on the rollcall soon to occur in this Senate Chamber, what will the next broadcast on the Voice of America report in extenuation? Will any alibi be believed? Could our finest fiction writers frame a defense which would be given credence?

As we sit here today, Mr. President, the Northwest Territories are represented in the Canadian Parliament by Hon. M. A. Hardie, of the Liberal Party. The Yukon Territory is represented in the Canadian Parliament by Hon. Erik Neilsen, of the Conservative Party. Mr. Neilsen comes from frontier Whitehorse, where I once served in the American Army during construction of the great Alcan Highway. It lies at the headwaters of the Yukon River. Mr. Hardie comes from the remote gold-mining community of Yellowknife, on Great Slave Lake.

The Yukon Territory has 12,190 inhabitants and the Northwest Territories have 19,313 inhabitants, according to the latest Canadian census. Both Mr. Hardie and Mr. Neilsen are full voting members of the Canadian Parliament. They have all the privileges, power, and authority of members from the great cities of Canada, such as Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver.

But Delegate E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, who represents the 200,000 residents of the Territory of Alaska, has no vote in our House of Representatives. He cannot vote in committee; he cannot vote on the floor.

What does this do to our professions of democracy? Some 31,000 people in the Canadian north country have two full voting members of Parliament in Canada's Parliament, at Ottawa. But some 200,000 people in the American north country—the neighbors, if you please, of these Canadians—have no voting Member at all in either the Senate or the House of Representatives, at Washington, D. C. This condition exists in our practice of democracy, although the British Empire often gets scolded by us for not being sufficiently generous in granting self-government and self-determination.

It was Emerson who said:

What you are stands over you the while, and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary.

ALASKA, AND SOVIET DENIAL OF FREEDOM

Furthermore, Mr. President, Alaska is our nearest terrain to the tyranny which imperils the Free World. The latter is, of course, the Soviet Union. On a clear day at Bering Strait, the shores of Siberia loom menacingly across the water. Would it not be doubly dramatic, as a blow for democracy, to grant, at last, full membership in the Union to the land under the American flag which lies in closest proximity to the country where the right of the individual to free choice in government has hardly ever been known, namely, Russia?

Article III of the treaty by which Alaska was ceded to the United States for \$7,200,000 contains this provision:

The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to

remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country.

Let me repeat that promise, "to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

Yet, Mr. President, no Alaskan resident has ever voted for President of the United States or for any other fully sovereign public official. Has the promise been kept? Alas, it has been sun-dered.

I have talked before on statehood for Alaska, and that is why my remarks today are to be comparatively brief. I would not want to conclude them, however, without paying tribute to the diligence and statesmanship of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has been so cooperative and helpful in bringing this issue to the Senate floor. If we add a 49th star to our flag this week, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY well can claim that this is a permanent and enduring monument to his distinguished career in the United States Senate. He and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of our Territories Subcommittee, are thoroughly deserving of credit and praise for the advanced stage of the statehood effort.

Mr. President, I also wish to express my great admiration for the work done by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Both during much of the debate today in the Senate on the Alaskan statehood bill, and also during much of the debate on previous days, the junior Senator from Idaho has been the acting majority leader. I think that honor is fully deserved by him, because his speech of some weeks ago on the statehood issue was, without exception, so far as I am concerned, the most thorough, exhaustive, and effective presentation I have ever heard of the case to bring Alaska into the Union.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who represents, in part, my neighbor State, for his kind words.

I wish to congratulate him on the speech he is making, a succinct speech which might well be summed up by quoting the familiar motto, "Let us practice what we preach."

Mr. President, it seems to me that there will not be another time during this session, and perhaps there will not be a time in many, many years to come, when the Senate will have a comparable opportunity to act in accordance with

the motto, "Let us practice what we preach."

Yet, Mr. President, if Senators still believe in the principle of government by consent of the governed and in the principle of no taxation without representation — fundamental principles which lit the fires of the American Revolution—then it seems to me that the only possible course for us to follow is to grant to our fellow citizens in Alaska the rights which the people of the States of the United States have historically claimed for themselves.

So, Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for having focused attention upon this fundamental of all fundamentals in connection with the statehood issue which is before us.

With his permission I should like to read into the RECORD a statement made by the editor of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, who testified before the committee during the House hearings on statehood legislation. I think it is appropriate to have his statement printed at this point in the RECORD, because it is so easy for us to become smug about the rights our forefathers fought and died for when the Minute Men went forth to face the troops of George III. We have had those rights for many years. It was in 1912 that the last of the present States was admitted to the Union. How easy it is to become jaded, smug, and self-contented.

But what a different perspective the people of Alaska have. That is why I wish to read into the RECORD the statement made by Mr. C. W. Snedden, the publisher of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, at the House hearings on this statehood bill.

Mr. Snedden said:

It should be evident to you why American citizens want the full rights of citizenship. But I believe that some of you are spoiled in the sense that, like the child of a fortunate family, you have forgotten what it is like to be in want.

Have you ever heard the expression that "he might grow up to be President someday"? That is the fond hope of many parents when they look at their child.

But have you ever considered how this applies to a Territory where a father's fondest hope is that his child will grow up with the right just to vote for our President someday?

Mr. President, those are the rights we have been denying our fellow citizen in Alaska.

We cannot stand before the world and assert our moral leadership among the countries of the Western World if we deny to our very own what the people of the present 48 States have long and historically claimed for themselves.

So I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for having pointed to what seems to me to be the heart of the issue—principles so basic that the whole institution of our democracy rests squarely upon them.

I thank the Senator, for his indulgence.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I am particularly grateful he included in the RECORD the statement by Bill Snedden. I know Bill

Snedden personally. He is an able editor. He is a courageous editor. He is a vigorous spokesman for democracy in the north country.

I again want to say I think it is so appropriate that the Senator from Idaho has taken the leadership which he has on the question of statehood for Alaska. The States of the Pacific Northwest have much in common with Alaska. In my opinion, every argument that has been voiced against the admission of Alaska could have been voiced, with whatever cogency it has been voiced, against the admission of Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and the other great States of the Pacific Northwest, which were very much on the frontier and very much remote outposts of civilization at the time they gained their place in the Union.

I think I have spent as much time in Alaska as has any Member of the Senate, although I hope there soon will be two Members of the Senate who will be bona fide residents of Alaska, and who will put to shame the amount of time which I spent in Alaska.

In my opinion, the people of Alaska qualify for statehood. They qualify for statehood from the standpoint of citizenship, patriotism, education, culture, dignity, and their desire and burning ambition to become full-fledged American citizens. To me, that is the paramount and overwhelming issue.

Of course, one can present legal technicalities. One can offer legal technicalities against any bill or proposal presented by human beings. In my opinion, the basic question is that of democracy for the people of Alaska who will become full-fledged American citizens.

I share with the able Senator from Idaho, and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is soon to address us on this vital question, the belief that the people of Alaska are ready for full citizenship.

I listened to an able address yesterday in which it was pointed out that 200,000 residents in Alaska would be able very soon to match the votes in the United States Senate of the 3½ million to 4 million residents of Virginia. Of course, that is true, because, I trust, Alaska is going to be admitted as a State. But I point out that today the 3 million or 4 million residents of Virginia, under our present form of government, can match the 2 Senate votes of New York, with 18 million residents, or the 2 Senate votes of California, with 14 or 15 million residents. So if anyone is going to indict Alaska because 200,000 residents will have 2 Members in the Senate, then that is an indictment of the present ratio of Senators among the 48 States; and the situation of admitting Alaska would not drastically change it.

I want to thank the Senator from Idaho for his pertinent comments, as indeed are all his comments on this question pertinent.

In conclusion, Mr. President, one of the most compelling arguments I have read in behalf of statehood is a letter which has come to my desk from C. Girard Davidson, the able ex-Assistant Secretary of the Interior during the Truman administration, and presently a

lawyer and business executive with substantial commercial and industrial interests and investments in Alaska. All of us are concerned with Alaska's economic success. Mr. Davidson has cogently emphasized in this letter the importance of statehood to a thriving Alaskan economy. For example, he cites the gains to be attained inevitably in transportation if and when full membership in the Union becomes a reality. He also stresses the urgent need for a system of courts of original jurisdiction in Alaska, and this, too, will be a concomitance of statehood.

To anyone who doubts the significance of statehood to Alaskan wealth and prosperity, I commend a reading of ex-Secretary C. Girard Davidson's thoughtful letter. For that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Davidson has written to me as secretary of the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which plans an integrated pulp and lumber operation in the vast forests of southeastern Alaska.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHERN TIMBER CO.,
Portland, Oreg., June 10, 1958.
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As one who has business interests in Alaska, I encourage and support you in your able and consistent effort to gain statehood for this Territory. This is but long overdue justice warranted the people of the Territory.

The granting of statehood will go far toward removing from the record the shabby history of our Nation's 91-year neglected promise to provide the people of Alaska rights equal to those of all other American citizens. The granting of statehood will lie to rest the assertion that America does not practice what she preaches; that we proclaim self-government and democracy for others but that we deny self-government to the people of our own Territories.

Statehood will provide tremendous impetus to the economic life of both the Territory and the United States. Much has been reported of the vast wealth of the Territory represented by its mineral, timber, and natural resources. The fact that Alaska has paid for itself nearly 500 times is important, but more impressive is the untold wealth yet remaining in this undeveloped land. Even those who for selfish political reasons oppose statehood concede that there are tremendous development opportunities offered by this our last frontier.

What will statehood do to assist the development and expand the opportunities to business and industry? How will statehood help business? What will be done through granting statehood that is not now being done to encourage and promote industry in Alaska?

First, statehood will materially assist the Territory in its age-old and most important transportation problem. Because it is removed from connection with the transcontinental railroads of the continental United States, the Territory is overwhelmingly dependent upon water and air carriers, and the cost of transportation adds directly to the cost of living. In the Territory, even more than elsewhere, the establishment of reasonable transportation rates is imperative to sound business conduct. Transportation rates have not been reasonable for two reasons: (1) lack of regulatory control, and

(2) the Jones Act governing water shipments.

Presently, throughout the Territory, tariff structures formulated by organized transportation companies are constantly jeopardized by industrials participating in irresponsible wildcat trucking and transportation undertakings. These one-season operators all too often undercut well developed, established prices, garner vitally needed trade from permanent operators, and, because they are marginal operators, frequently inexperienced in the conduct of business in the Territory, they soon go bankrupt leaving a burden of uncollectible bills to the merchants and a loss of business to legitimate transportation companies.

In addition, the Government-owned Alaska Railroad is a victim of politics. This railroad alters tariffs and rates at a moment's notice, subjecting competitive trucking and barging transportation to Government-subsidized undercutting. The combination of wildcat operators and the subsidized railroad causes untold confusion in the transportation industry.

Establishing fair transportation rates is possible only through a properly organized regulatory body. With statehood, the Interstate Commerce Commission will provide this regulatory service and the new State of Alaska will enjoy a position of stability in its transportation life. Business will benefit by being able to properly determine present and future transportation costs.

Second, adding to the turbulent transportation picture is the ill-conceived Jones Act of 1920. The purpose of the Jones Act was to assist the shipbuilding and allied industries. However, it discriminated against the Territory by prohibiting the shipment to Alaska of any goods or products aboard foreign ships, specifically Canadian vessels, and authorized only United States bottoms to take on shipment destined for Alaska. This was naturally a boom to Seattle but it tripled the cost to the citizens of Alaska. The enactment of the Jones Act resulted in the complete elimination of competition. It caused hardship and discrimination against the residents of the Territory in the shipment of merchandise, food products and other commodities necessary and essential to the existence, progress, and development of the people of the Territory.

With statehood, the Jones Act will be removed, allowing a competitive condition to exist, and thus bringing about the lowering of transportation costs.

Air transportation, too, is restricted. The Scandinavian Airline Service, flying from Copenhagen to Tokyo, stops at Anchorage, but Alaskans are forbidden to embark or disembark; they must fly 3,000 miles to Los Angeles to board an aircraft bound for the Scandinavian countries.

Third, business and industry necessarily rely on the quick dispensation of justice through the courts. Disputes in business affairs are part and parcel of business operation. The injured parties look to the law for protection and redress. In any of the 48 States local courts are established for the quick handling of litigation. But in the Territory of Alaska the people are prevented from establishing their own judiciary; the judicial system is completely controlled by Congress, and presently is so overburdened that judges are as far back as 3 years in actual case trials. The third division presently has an impossible caseload of over 1,500 cases pending for each judge. Justice delayed is justice denied, and justice denied inevitably works to the benefit of the lawless. This does not create a condition attractive to business and industry. Once Alaska is a State she will establish her own judicial system, and the present antiquated organization will be replaced. Business can then be assured litigation will be handled in a normal and prompt way.

Fourth, adequate economical communications are imperative to sound business operation. Presently, throughout the larger share of the Territory, and between Alaska and the continental United States, the Alaska Communication Service—a branch of the United States Army—provides the only telephone and telegraph service. This is a splendid organization, with a proud and distinguished history. But what of tomorrow? ACS is a creature of our Federal Government and is dependent upon varying approaches to the Federal budget. Rates are subject to the pressure of politics, the changing attitudes of the executive department, and, of course, bureaucratic action. Prior to rate changes or even the termination of service, the customer need not be consulted, even hearings need not be held. In planning a business venture, not only the cost of the service—which is, of course, important—but even the actual continuation of the service is frequently unknown. With statehood, the Federal Communications Commission would have a powerful voice in these affairs, and the new State could, and would, institute regulations adequate to assure constant and reasonable service.

Fifth, business best flourishes when the community in which it is located prospers. Communities, in order to thrive and develop, must control their land and resources. Today, Alaska controls less than 1 percent of its own land, and so long as this deplorable situation exists the Territory can never develop. Just as the Territory remains restrained from its potential growth, so are the industries located within it stifled from full development. It is indeed amazing that, though Alaska has no control or ownership over 99 percent of its taxable or revenue-producing land, the Territory has been able to finance schools, construct and maintain roads, and operate its government as well as it has. With the passage of H. R. 7999, Alaska will gain possession of about 50 percent of its own land; the agencies governing it will be located in Alaska; development can be locally planned. This condition will tremendously benefit the new State.

The added revenues from the newly acquired properties will go far toward underwriting the costs of the public projects required to create decent living conditions for the growing population—a most important requirement of industry and business.

Sixth, continuity is imperative to sound business. Long-term financing must be premised on long-range planning. Business always contemplates the possibility of shifts and changes—but not changes in the basic form of government. Under present circumstances business must hazard a year-by-year operation—never being certain whether the next year will see the continuation of Territorial government or introduce State government. This does not meet the requirements of good business conduct.

Furthermore, the larger lending institutions do not understand Territorial government and are therefore reluctant to enter an area governed—or ungoverned—in this peculiar manner. They are unwilling to assume the heavy expense of conducting their business subject to constant reviews from Washington, D. C. As a consequence, there is limited investment capital, which, in turn, results in a distressingly high cost of money.

With statehood, an end will be brought to the unknown conditions of Territorial government, and business and industry will be able and anxious to open the new markets and develop the new State.

Sincerely yours,

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
Secretary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like briefly to state my views in support of the admission of Alaska to our Union as its 49th State. This is an opportunity to reaffirm our principles; now is the time to act on them.

I have had the pleasure of serving either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate since 1939, and I have always supported vigorously resolutions and bills for the admission of Alaska as a State into the Union. With each term of Congress, I have been more strongly convinced than I was before that it is our duty and our obligation, and that it would be a good thing for the United States, to take this action.

During the time I have had an opportunity of serving in Congress, I have served with two delegates from Alaska. One of the impressive facts about the effort for statehood which should convince us that the new State would take its full share of the responsibilities of a State of the Union is the type of representation Alaska has sent to the House of Representatives, and the delegates who have been elected, under the Tennessee plan, to be Senators and Representatives from Alaska.

For many years Anthony Diamond was a delegate from the Territory of Alaska. Mr. Diamond was well educated and a highly qualified and capable Delegate. He had a great understanding not only of the problems of the Territory of Alaska, but those of the Nation and of the world.

Since 1945 E. L. BARTLETT has been the Delegate from Alaska, and he is Delegate at the present time. Mr. BARTLETT is highly respected as a person, and his public service is appreciated by all Members of Congress, whether in the House or in the Senate.

The men I have mentioned are typical of the type of Senators and Representatives we can expect to come from the new State of Alaska.

The Senators-elect from Alaska are Ernest Gruening, who, as we all know, has served as Governor of Alaska, and who is a very capable person, and William E. Egan, who was a member of the legislature, a participant and member of the Alaska Constitutional Convention, and a man of fine ability.

The Representative-elect is Ralph J. Rivers, who was the attorney general of Alaska, and a member of the constitutional convention.

Then, too, I have known many members of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska. I have known many of the officials of some of the cities of Alaska. I have known officers of the Territorial government of Alaska. They are men and women of ability. They have performed their governmental duties well. They are dedicated to our democratic system. They have provided honest government. They have given thoughtful consideration to the issues coming before the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Alaska.

So we know Alaska will send outstanding representatives to the Congress, both as Members of the House and of the Senate. These representatives will take their jobs seriously and

perform well their legislative and executive duties for the new State.

To me, Mr. President, this is an opportunity to reaffirm our principles. Now is the time to act.

As outlined in the reports of both the House and Senate, the traditional requirements for statehood throughout our history have been as follows:

First. That the inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and are sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government;

Second. That a majority of the electorate desire statehood; and

Third. That the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Compelling evidence asserts Alaska's fulfillment of all of these requirements. The committees are convinced, the House of Representatives is convinced, and the Nation is convinced that statehood for Alaska will promote the best interests of both that Territory and the Nation.

Alaska has been a part of this country for 91 years. In the course of these years, Seward's Folly has become a dynamic and promising land, constituting one of America's best investments in the future. And the experiment of statehood has never failed. Twenty-nine States have been admitted to statehood from a Territorial status, often in the face of major obstacles and difficulties, which, as with Alaska, often included repeated Congressional refusals to pass enabling legislation.

This was the case in the admission of my own State of Tennessee which established a precedent in 1796—the Tennessee plan. In that year, two Senators-elect from the Territory of Tennessee personally presented their petition for the admittance of Tennessee into the Union and they were successful, as were the several other States which followed this procedure.

The Tennessee plan originated with my State. Tennessee is typical of the generally progressive attitude of most States of the Union in connection with the question of Alaska statehood. I have never seen such a unanimity of support by the leading daily and weekly newspapers on any particular issue as exists in favor of statehood for Alaska, as expressed by the editorials from newspapers of my State.

Yesterday, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning at page 12028, I placed in the RECORD a number of such editorials from leading newspapers in Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, and quite a number of other cities, in favor of statehood for Alaska.

A few days ago I read in Time magazine that there is a legend in Tennessee that in Nashville, our capital, the two newspapers there seldom agree upon anything. Those two newspapers are the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner. The story is to the effect that the only thing they ever agreed upon was the time of day. However, the time came when they got into an

argument as to whether Nashville should be on eastern time or central time. One newspaper took one side and the other took the other side. So they had fallen out even with respect to the time of day.

Both newspapers state their positions well. It so happens that I usually agree with the Nashville Tennessean, which I think is one of the great newspapers of the United States. It is a liberal, progressive newspaper.

However, in the case of Alaska statehood, unlike the issue of the time of day or other issues upon which the two newspapers disagreed, both newspapers in the State capital are strongly in favor of statehood for Alaska, and have editorialized on the subject very frequently.

Today my attention was called to a thoughtful editorial in another Tennessee newspaper, the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle of June 17, which points out all the reasons for granting statehood, and answers an argument which we frequently hear, to the effect that the trouble with Alaska is that it is not contiguous to the other States of the Union. This editorial points out that when California was admitted into the Union in 1850, it lay 650 miles from the nearest other State, which was Texas. There was no State between the two.

In this case, we know that Alaska can be reached by air or by sea, and that between Alaska and the States of the Union there is a friendly bond and the best of relations, which will always continue.

In 1955 a proposed State constitution was drafted by an Alaskan convention, and subsequently approved by a better than 2 to 1 majority of the Alaskan electorate. At the same election in April 1956, the voters of Alaska also chose 2 outstanding men for Senators and 1 representative-elect to petition for recognition, as did the 2 men from Tennessee in 1796. Mr. President, I urge this body to likewise heed their pleas for the admission of their Territory.

History has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that statehood will be beneficial to Alaska. In every case, local responsibility has stimulated progress, and the Nation also stands to reap benefits from Alaska's growth. The legal and moral grounds for Alaska's admission are clear. And we have received ample evidence that statehood would be sound for many practical reasons as well. Statehood would give support to American foreign policy, and strengthen the position of the United States in world affairs, giving greater strength to our overall defense. Statehood would give new stimulus to enterprise and private capital to make Alaska a strong segment of America's future economy. The resources of that Territory, still largely latent, should be developed more rapidly with statehood, promoting not only the welfare and growth of the Territory, but also strengthening the security of the Nation. Statehood will grant to the people of Alaska the right to send representatives to Congress, in accordance with our traditional ideas of local self-government. Alaska pays all Federal taxes, obeys all Federal laws, sends its citizens to defend the Nation, and it de-

serves to vote in the Federal Government which makes its laws. Alaska needs statehood, and the Nation will benefit from her admission. I think it would create a new interest and a new enthusiasm in the United States to have this large and promising frontier to develop.

By the terms of the treaty by which Alaska was acquired, we pledged its inhabitants the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States. Statehood is the only logical fulfillment of that pledge. The statehood principle has been the basis for the building of our Nation, and by reaffirming it now, we shall not only strengthen our country, but also affirm to the people of Alaska, and indeed the world, that we have not forgotten our traditions—that the extension of liberty is still our goal.

In our party platforms we have pledged ourselves to grant statehood to Alaska, and the American people have registered their overwhelming approval of it. I think the party platforms of our political parties deserve to be implemented by the enthusiastic support of the pending bill.

More information has been assembled regarding Alaska than in the case of any Territory which has been admitted to the Union. The study of every facet of the effect of Alaska's statehood must lead one to conclude that this Territory is ready, willing, and able to support statehood. In the interest of the people of both Alaska and the Nation as a whole, I urge that this bill be passed. Alaska has proved its right to join the Union. Its inhabitants have met every reasonable test, and we cannot continue to deny them the rights of full citizenship. We must keep faith with them, and in so doing we shall dramatically provide the world with an illustration that the dynamics of true democracy in America have present and practical meaning.

Mr. President, I have had the opportunity of visiting Alaska, although not so frequently as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who has done such outstanding work in advocacy of the bill on the floor of the Senate, or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who preceded me in speaking on the floor today. However, I did spend some time in Alaska a number of years ago. I did not visit all parts of Alaska, because that would take a considerable length of time. I was impressed with the eagerness and the fresh outlook of the people, and the stability of the citizens there. I was most impressed, as has been everyone who has visited Alaska, with the unanimity of the burning desire of the people of Alaska to play their full part in the progress and future greatness of our American Republic.

Mr. President, statehood for Alaska will be good for the Senate. It will be good for the United States. It will be good for the Free World.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial from the Clarks-ville Leaf-Chronicle, to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-NINER

First in over 45 years would be the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union, for which the Senate seems likely to vote, and soon. The House voted for it on May 26 by 208 to 166, with certain conditions to be accepted by a referendum in November. So it will be 1959, probably, before Alaska actually comes in.

This would be 47 years since New Mexico and Arizona became the 47th and 48th States, respectively, away back in 1912. It would be by far the longest time between admissions. The longest previous interval was 15 years, between Missouri (24th State) in 1821 and Arkansas (25th) in 1886.

This would not be the first time a State was admitted without being contiguous to another State. When California got statehood in 1850, for instance, it lay 650 miles from the nearest other State, Texas. But the area that stretched in between belonged to the United States—this would be the first time a State was admitted without touching on other United States territory.

The estimated (1957) civilian population of Alaska is 165,000. Seven of the 17 States admitted in the last 100 years had fewer than 165,000 inhabitants at the time. Of course, the total population was much lower then than now, but even on a proportionate basis the population of Alaska today is about the same as that of Wyoming when admitted in 1890 and much higher than that of Nevada when admitted in 1864.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the very able address he has delivered to the Senate on the issue of Alaskan statehood. He has demonstrated once again the foresight and statesmanship which have given him the reputation of being one of the leading Members of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Idaho very much. There are many reasons why I am in favor of Statehood for Alaska, but one of the best reasons for making a speech on the subject in the Senate is to receive the commendation of so fine a Senator as my colleague from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

SIX DAYS UNTIL JULY 1

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, every day since June 13, I have made a brief statement on the floor of the Senate with regard to a possible substantial increase in the price of steel on July 1. Some time ago it was reported that the United States Steel Corp. and other steel companies planned to raise the price of steel on July 1. There have been some indications to the effect that this might not happen; at least, that the United States Steel Corp. may not take the lead in that regard.

I hope that will be the case. Other Senators have spoken on the subject. I dare say that the greatest desire of the American people at the present time is to stop the rounds of inflation which are taking their toll on the savings and income of tens of millions of American people, and which have caused unemployment and will set us on a disastrous course if they continue.

There is a tremendous interest, not only in Congress but also all over the United States, in trying to hold the line and to stop inflation. The one big thing which will cause inflation to have another great spurt, destructive of our economy, is an increase in the price of steel. Leaders of the steel industry and leaders of labor recognize that fact. Certainly this is a time for statesmanship and reasonableness on the part of both sides.

Yesterday the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the Consumer Price Index had risen again in May to a new alltime high. The index now stands at a level of 123.6, which is some 3.5 percent above the level of only 12 months ago. In the 8 years since June 1950, just before the outbreak of the Korean conflict, the cost of living has risen no less than 21 percent. Most of this increase has, of course, occurred during the years in which the present administration has been in office.

According to press accounts, administration spokesmen would have consumers take comfort in the fact that this latest increase was not due to higher prices of foods. In past months the same spokesmen have been discounting the importance of price increases in administered price industries on the grounds that most of the increase in the cost of living was due to higher food prices. In my statement on the Senate floor on June 17 I described the way in which higher prices for steel contribute to higher food prices by raising the costs of farming, processing, distribution, transportation, retailing—in fact, everywhere along the line between the farmer and the housewife.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who has pointed out on the floor of the Senate that a real catastrophe would come to the American people and to our economy if there should be an increase in the price of steel. I proudly yield to him.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I wonder if he will agree with me that there is evidence in our economy that we are about to see an end to the constant monthly increases in the cost of living, because the last few months have indicated a tapering off of the increase, and that if we do not have another round of price increases, particularly in manufactured products, we may be able to stabilize the price level where it is now. My question is, whether there would not be set off another inflationary force if the President should be unable to persuade the steel manufacturers to refrain from an increase in the price of steel at the end of this month.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. I thank him very much for bringing out that point. Many of our leading economists and students of the subject feel—and there is factual evidence to support

their view—that, while there was a slight increase in the cost of living in the month of May, there is about to be a leveling off, and we may be able to hold the line; but, as matters stand now, if there should be a \$5 or \$6 a ton increase in the price of steel there would be set off another spiral of inflation, which would probably require some readjustments all the way around.

It is felt that there would be nothing more disastrous to our economy, or that would set back the little progress we have made in coming out of the recession, than another spiral of inflation. It would mean more unemployment, fewer sales, and fewer goods bought. It would also mean greater hardship for people with fixed incomes. The effect of a price increase in steel on July 1 is too horrible to contemplate.

Mr. CLARK. There are only 5 or 6 more days in which the President can take the strong executive action which the Senator from Tennessee and I believe would be most helpful in preventing such a real catastrophe from taking place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. The power of persuasion of the President is great. The power of public opinion, if the President asks the leaders of industry and labor to do something in the interest of the Nation, is very substantial. There are only 6 days left for the President to take strong and affirmative leadership, as expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, to get the leaders of both sides together in the greater interest of the country. There are only 6 days left in which to do that.

Now that overall food prices have for a change remained stable, to what arguments will the administration spokesmen now turn in their efforts to exonerate the Nation's basic industries as contributors to higher living costs?

It appears that the May increase was due principally to increased hospitalization insurance premiums and the ending of local gasoline price wars. It may be anticipated that administration spokesmen will point out, if they have not already done so, that neither of these areas is itself an administered price industry. But let us examine the matter more closely. Why have hospitalization costs risen? They have gone up for one reason, among others, because of the increased cost of equipment, much of which, as everyone who has visited a hospital knows, is made of stainless steel. It would be absurd, of course, to attribute all the rise in hospital equipment costs to the increase in the price of steel; it would be equally absurd, however, to ignore it completely as a contributing cost factor.

The cost of living in May also rose because of the higher prices for gasoline which, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stemmed from "termination of price wars in several cities." Gasoline price wars generally stem from weaknesses in the petroleum price structure. Following last year's price increase in petroleum at the time of the Suez crisis, the big oil companies have engaged in

heroic and farflung measures to stabilize the petroleum price structure at the newer and higher level. Extraordinary curtailments have been made in both domestic production and in imports. It should not come as a matter of surprise that as a result of these measures consumers are now having to pay higher prices for gasoline.

In its issue of June 23, the Wall Street Journal presented an interesting example of how an increase in the price of a basic product such as steel or petroleum tends to pyramid before it reaches the ultimate buyer. I quote an example cited in the article:

A "tractor maker explains how last year's 4 percent increase in the price of steel affected one model in his line. Immediately after the steel hike, prices of stampings from a supplier went up 4 percent, too. Forging shops raised prices. Machine shops passed along the increase. Components such as wheels, hydraulic systems, and axles arrived with higher price tags. Where costs of that tractor totaled \$1,800 on July 1, several months later they were \$1,875."

If to this there is added the customary 23 percent markup for farm machinery dealers, the total increase would have been from \$2,338 to \$2,435. In short, as a result of the chain of increases set off by a \$6 a ton increase in the price of steel, the farmer would be paying \$97 more for the same tractor in 1958 than in 1957.

In this article, the Wall Street Journal notes the argument made by United States Steel Corporation that higher prices of steel have a negligible effect on the prices paid by ultimate buyers. On the basis of a survey of metal-using firms which it had conducted, the Journal concludes that few steel users agree with the inconsequential effects of price rises for the metal, however.

Mr. President, if President Eisenhower is to act in order to prevent a steel price increase from taking place on July 1, there remain only 6 more days. Actually, there are some signs, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] pointed out last week, that the steel companies may have changed their thinking in recent days and may not actually go through at this time with the increase which had been accepted as a foregone conclusion as recently as a week ago in the trade and financial press. I note that the Journal of Commerce for today, June 25, contains an interesting story to this effect. According to the story, one important reason for the delay in raising prices is that it will also put the industry critics in Congress on the defensive, temporarily at least. I do not quite understand how a decision by the industry to follow a course of action which many of us have been urging upon it every day since June 13 would put me on the defensive. But if the steel industry were to serve the public interest by holding off its price increase, I would be glad to be considered in any conceivable position, defensive or otherwise.

If the steel companies will hold the price line I am sure that many of us who have been talking about the matter will

not only be willing to go on the defensive, but also to pay high tribute to the companies and to their managements for their cooperation in averting another disastrous round of inflation.

Mr. President, it is difficult to understand what may be taking place at this point in the steel industry. There may be some indications that at this time the United States Steel Corp. does not want to be the leader in what will be done. Customarily, when United States Steel raises its prices, it takes the lead, and others follow suit. Most of the correspondence I have had and most of the correspondence others have had has been directed at the leader, the United States Steel Corp., in the hope that it would take the leadership in holding down the steel prices.

If United States Steel will not raise its prices, but will hold the present ones, it will deserve a great deal of credit, as will the chairman of its board, Mr. Roger Blough. If United States Steel will hold its prices and will hold the line, and if Bethlehem Steel will hold its prices, then if some of the other steel companies raise their prices, even temporarily, perhaps they will soon have to lower them again.

But, on the other hand, if United States Steel and other steel companies want to raise their prices, but are merely trying to get someone else to take the lead, then their action is just as bad as if they had taken the lead themselves.

Mr. President, the arguments in regard to trying to prevent ruinous inflation and to protect the country and protect the consumers, which we have been making to United States Steel, apply equally well to all the other steel companies. I hope they will act in the public interest.

We know that the President wants to stop the existing inflation. I hope he will exert his great influence in that direction, just as the influence of other Presidents has been exerted in years past, even before the existence of the Office of Price Administration.

But, Mr. President, the time in which to do something about this matter is rapidly running out; only 6 days remain before July 1.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ETHICAL STANDARDS LEGISLATION

During the delivery of Mr. KEFAUVER's remarks:

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his courtesy.

Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post and Times Herald published on its editorial page an editorial entitled "Mote and Beam" which deals with a speech made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTE AND BEAM

There is at least one dividend from the Sherman Adams affair. It is causing a great deal of soul searching on the part of other officials and legislators in regard to the acceptance of gifts and the doing of favors. Senator NEUBERGER has recently delivered two speeches in the Senate in an effort to stir the consciences of legislators who accept large campaign contributions and then feel obligated to the donors when legislation in which they are interested comes up for enactment. Senator CASE has renewed his suggestion of a Congressional pool that would receive and distribute gifts made to Members of Congress.

The fact is that gift taking is an established custom in our political system. Some of these gifts can be disregarded because they are of little intrinsic value. But an enormous number are of sufficient value to sway the judgment of ordinary men. Senator NEUBERGER asks: "Is Sherman Adams any more indebted to Mr. Goldfine for gifts than a man who sits in the Senate or in a governor's chair is indebted to those who collected \$100,000 from big business or from trade-union political-education funds to pay for his campaign expenses? Is Sherman Adams, with his \$2,400 rug and \$700 vicuna cloth coat more obligated to render unethical favors than is a Member of Congress who is dependent every few years on 20 times that amount from bankers, natural-gas and private-utility owners, and distillery executives to finance his billboards and radio and TV shows? What is the difference between one gift and another?"

Senator NEUBERGER had previously renewed his plea for what he calls a Federal Ethical Standards Act. He has introduced a bill of this sort designed to extend to legislators the conflict-of-interest laws which now apply only to executive officials. Certainly there is much merit in his contention that the legislator who accepts a fat fee for making a speech may be just as vulnerable to favoritism in his official actions as are gift-taking executives.

These observations do not diminish the seriousness of Mr. Adams' error of judgment in accepting gifts from a friend and asking favors for him from an independent Government agency. But they do help to place the general problem in its proper perspective. The Neuberger proposals to extend the conflict-of-interest laws to Congressmen and to publicize their sources of outside income will be about as popular on Capitol Hill as frost in July. But Congress cannot reasonably hold to a double standard. The healthy interest it has aroused in the mote within Sherman Adams' eye is certain to provoke a still larger interest in the beam in its own eye.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the brief comments I am about to make be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues and state my own strong support of the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon with respect to the desirability of having a conflict-of-interest statute passed which

would be binding upon Members of Congress as well as members of the executive branch of the Government.

Furthermore, I support the efforts of the junior Senator from Oregon to obtain a more realistic law having to do with campaign contributions. I regret very much that other Members of this body do not share our views, and that the Senator from Oregon has been under some criticism because of an alleged inconsistency between his views and the position that campaign contributions are in a different category from gifts such as Mr. Sherman Adams accepted and such as I suspect many Members of both bodies of Congress have from time to time accepted without making a disclosure.

I am sure my friend from Oregon is keenly aware of the difference between campaign contributions and gifts. I do not think the Senator from Oregon ever fell into the error of assimilating those two things as identical.

Mr. President, the editorial points up a message which I hope our colleagues will take to heart, so that the proposed legislation sponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon may become law in the near future.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very generous, characteristically kind, and effective remarks.

Of course I know there is a distinction between campaign contributions and gifts. However, I firmly believe the great American President, Theodore Roosevelt, was right when he said, half a century ago, that huge campaign contributions and such donations in American politics did have a potentially sinister impact, and that we should try to bring about legislation to eliminate them. I stand by that statement.

I hope eventually—perhaps in the long distant vistas of time the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned yesterday—we shall accomplish that goal.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me under the same unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

I should like to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon that I made a proposal in a speech Monday night in New York for the drafting of a code of ethics both for legislators and for Federal officials. The reason I did so was that I had the honor to inaugurate the administration of such a code in the State of New York when I first became attorney general.

I invite that to the attention of Senators because, after analyzing the bill of the Senator from Oregon, I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that it poses for us a problem in the dimensions it should have. I found the bill concentrated rather heavily upon the criminal provisions of the statutes. I think it may

very well be that a contribution can be made to all of our thinking through some reference to the experience we have had in New York with the code of ethics since 1954. I mention that because I hope very much I shall have the interested attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon, since the Senator from Oregon has taken such an estimable lead in this matter, when we come to thresh out exactly what we ought to do.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New York. I know any such constructive proposal the Senator from New York has made will be of great assistance in the effort to develop some kind of code of conduct, behavior, and ethics which will be of assistance at all levels of government.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

REGULATORY POLICIES—WISE AND OTHERWISE

During the delivery of Mr. KEFAUVER's remarks,

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor and with the further understanding that my remarks shall be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Alabama, with that understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the causes of our precarious economic situation are, I fear, multiple. We are reaping the fruits of mistakes of commission and omission in many fields. Of particular concern at this time are those economic areas where the Government has played an important role in shaping our economic course, where the regulatory agencies have by their policies and decisions—wise and otherwise—had a clear impact on the economy.

In this regard I am particularly interested in the field of civil aviation. In this field we can see clearly and pinpoint certain basic factors and patterns which may serve us well in studying other, even broader areas of the economy. Involved also are the issues of small business, of monopoly versus free competitive enterprise, of public interest in a quasi-utility field and the role of the regulatory body. Finally, certain recent indications within the regulatory agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, prompt the hope that there may be a growing awareness by the Board of the need to reexamine some of its doctrines of the past.

In 1951, as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I filed with the Senate the unanimous report of that committee, pointing out the need for a liberal policy in admitting new competition to the passenger market in aviation. This was the battle for

"the right of entry" of the large irregular, or so-called nonscheduled air carriers opposed by the certificated subsidized carriers supported by the CAB majority. Our position was reiterated and carried forward by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], when he assumed chairmanship of the committee in 1953.

As the evidence, the expert testimony, and the economic data mounted before our committee it became ever clearer that competition was the oxygen of the new air transport industry and that this oxygen was being shut off by monopoly practices fostered by both the major air carriers and the CAB itself.

We were disturbed by the fact that this infant industry, which had grown 40 times in dollar volume since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, had witnessed a contracting of the number of carriers authorized to serve the trunk routes where the public demanded air service. From 18 original grandfather carriers in 1938 the number has been reduced by mergers and consolidations to 12, while gross business had grown 4,000 percent in 12 years. Although there had been over 100 applications for certification by the smaller air carriers, not one had been granted. What worried our committee as much as the growing monopoly of the sky by a few companies was the apparent approval of and acquiescence in this situation by the CAB. We feared that America might well be on its way to having a single airline—on the European pattern, with the result ultimately of a nationalized civil aviation industry.

As each of the new, veteran-owned postwar independent carriers grew and flourished in the new coach market which they pioneered, it was systematically grounded by CAB edict. The carriers were charged with violations of special regulations devised, as our committee revealed, as a checkrein on their existence. These economic regulations were so ingenious that compliance was economically infeasible, and defiance legally impossible. Our committee repeatedly warned that this CAB policy of strangulation by regulation would ultimately have dire consequences. We felt that the industry, the traveling public, and the Government would ultimately pay dearly for the restrictive policies which had become CAB doctrine. The courts could not go into the economic doctrines, but merely the procedural questions—and here they found the CAB had used a clean knife.

When the oldest and strongest of the large irregular carriers, Trans American Airlines, was grounded on June 6, 1957, after an extended battle with the Board and in the courts—manifestly guilty in the words of the CAB of flying "too frequently and too regularly"—it was not hard to calculate the chain reaction which would ensue.

First, all competition and threat of competition is eliminated. The sky was closed to those carriers which had been acting as the competitive spur; carriers which operated without any subsidy or mail pay and could provide an authentic yardstick of costs were eliminated.

Second, sealed off from competition, the big airlines' demand for a fare increase was the classic next step. We are now in this phase, with certain members of the banking community, certain newspapers, and the tireless public-relations departments of the large airlines clamoring for a fare increase.

Third, as fares go up, public utilization will go down. Newly won air passengers, attracted by genuine economy of time and money, will revert to surface transportation, and in many instances there will be less travel. Thus the air carriers will soon be faced with a shrinking passenger market of their own making at the very time when they have bigger aircraft, more expensive aircraft, and more aircraft than ever before.

Fourth, the carriers, confronted by a dizzy spiral of mounting deficits and declining revenues, will turn to the Treasury for subsidy, pleading, no doubt, that their new plush jets are a national defense asset. One major carrier has already petitioned for subsidy and there are preliminary murmurs throughout the industry.

There, in four steps, we have the trail from profit to subsidy. I submit, Mr. President, that the civil aviation industry is on its way to creating its own manmade depression, quite apart from and independent of the general economic recession. The role of the CAB may well be decisive in holding the industry to a sensible approach, and in protecting the aviation companies from their own doctrine of scarcity.

For this reason, Mr. President, those of us who have long favored lower fares as the means to a solvent private air transportation industry regretted the way the CAB majority recently acquiesced to the clamor of the air carriers and approved an interim across-the-board 6.6 percent fare increase for the certificated airlines. One is constrained to remark, judging by the mounting frenzy and fury of the carriers while the Board was deliberating its decision, that the Board majority may have acted reluctantly and without total conviction in this step. The pressure was terrific.

It is heartening and refreshing, therefore, to read the dissenting opinion of CAB Member G. Joseph Minetti, which has just been published. I have read few more profound and perceptive analyses of the airline fare situation. One must hark back to the tenure of former CAB Member Joseph P. Adams to recall a CAB dissent which argues so cogently for the public interest and the future of air travel.

We have noted the barrage of words from the certificated airline industry attempting to prove the need for higher fares. We are told that the jets will cost money. Of course they will cost money. But they will also make money, and they should be financed through normal corporate channels and not by a levy on today's passengers.

Why are airline profits down, aside from the causes associated with the current recession? The industry says fares are too low. But few aside from Mr. Minetti have questioned management efficiency. There is no hint, aside

from Mr. Minetti's dissent, that the big airlines may have overexpanded, both in equipment and scheduling, to the point that their service is no longer adjusted to demand.

It is significant that although the total traffic of domestic trunklines increased 11 percent in 1957, the percentage of available ton-miles used—the load factor—dropped three points, from 55.8 percent to 52.8 percent. The industry uses this as an argument for higher fares. But is it? Why do so many airplanes fly virtually empty? Is it because fares are too low? The industry wants higher fares. Will they fill the empty seats?

Historically, airline fares have been trending downward, not upward. Low-fare pioneering by the independent airlines helped bring this about. Aircoach service, first opposed and then reluctantly adopted by the big certificated lines, brought an end to Federal subsidy payments and brought air travel to millions of Americans. Today aircoach accounts for 49 percent of all air travel.

The increase in coach fares is especially disturbing to Mr. Minetti, and to me. Coach service is indeed "the goose that laid the golden egg," as Mr. Minetti says it is. Seventy-five percent of all adult Americans have never flown commercially. On the threshold of a great industry expansion into the jet age, are higher fares the proper way to attract these people to air travel?

Moreover, we must not overlook Mr. Minetti's warning that "the tendency to price all categories of air transportation out of reach of a significant segment of the general public may signal a reversal of the recent diversion from surface to air travel and may contribute the first step toward a return to Federal subsidy."

At the present time the CAB's general passenger fare investigation is in progress. It should be stressed that the CAB—a ratemaking body—has never had a passenger fare investigation in its history. It would seem prudent for the Board to defer making any decisions to further hike passenger fares, as the large carriers would like them to do, until such an investigation has been completed. I, for one, would strongly favor giving the Board a most adequate appropriation so that it can do justice to its responsibility as a ratemaking body, and acquit this function without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Minetti's historic dissent in the CAB fare-increase decision be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, so that Members of the Congress may be thoroughly familiar with this issue, for it is obvious that the CAB will need strong backing if it is to become as firm as Mr. Minetti in defending the public interest, and protecting the air carriers from their own folly.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATE DISSENT, OPINION AND ORDER NO. E-12203 IN THE TWA INTERIM FARE INCREASE CASE, DOCKET NO. 9288, DATED FEBRUARY 25, 1958

Member Minetti dissenting:

I cannot join the majority in concluding that, under the ratemaking standards of the

act, a need for an interim fare increase has been established by the staff analysis and other information available to the Board on January 24, 1958.¹ No changes in traffic and cost conditions of sufficient import have been presented to the Board since our opinion and denial of petitions for reconsideration in the suspended passenger fare increase case² (hereinafter "6 percent case") to warrant any divergent decision here. I am now, as then, of the view that changes in the domestic trunkline fare level must await decision in the current general passenger fare investigation³ (hereinafter "docket 8008"), a proceeding designed for that very purpose.

Even assuming that some interim fare increase is required, the majority's action in permitting an increase in coach fares, as well as in first class fares, is especially regrettable, for that action threatens to kill the goose that laid the golden egg; viz, low priced air transportation. Coach service, with its low fares, was introduced during relatively depressed times and that service, more than any other single factor, filled empty seats, took the industry off subsidy, and made possible the good profits which were realized during the past decade. Coach customers, obviously sensitive to cost, were originally lured from surface transportation by coach's combination of speed and low fares. I am now fearful that the present fare increase, aided by the current recession, may well cause coach customers, in ever increasing numbers, to desert the air and to revert to their former travel habits.

Even more alarming than the possibility of alienating today's coach customers is the effect of this fare increase on the staggering percentage of adult Americans, approximately 75 percent, who have never flown commercially.⁴ On the eve of tremendous capacity expansion, air transportation fares must appeal to this segment of our population if the aviation industry is to continue in sound economic health. The coach fare increase granted by the majority, will further separate air transportation from many of these potential customers, to whom price is a major determinant in selecting a mode of travel.⁵ In my opinion, this is a shortsighted way of promoting aviation. At a time when this industry needs many more passengers, and at a time when an economic recession has hit this country, the extraction of more dollars from today's air travelers will have a dangerously retarding effect on the growth of air transportation.

Perhaps, this risk must be taken. If that be so, it should only be taken after a careful analysis and a full realization of all possible consequences. Whatever may be our decision in docket 8008, it must be one reached only after a thorough examination of all factors and all possible consequences of fare adjustments. The long or short range need for additional revenues, the need for additional passengers, the retarding effects which a fare increase may have on traffic growth, all of these must be carefully weighted before a fare increase is granted. We do no service

to the industry or to the public to assume the answer to any of these issues for interim purposes, as the majority has done here. The answer must be found in docket 8008.

I have no idea at this time how these issues will be decided in docket 8008. It may well be, as Member Gurney has indicated in his dissenting opinion, that a greater fare increase is required; for docket 8008 may reveal that the industry's financial need is so great that traffic retarding effects of a fare increase must be risked. On the other hand, it may well be determined that the future expansion of air transportation lies in lower fares. In this respect, we may find that while the financial need is great, a fare increase would be self-defeating, because of the harmful effects it would have on existing and potential traffic. Finally, we may conclude that some other method of increasing profits should be explored, such as the elimination of excise taxes on air transportation.⁶

These are all possible end results of our current fare investigation, none of which can be, or has been, properly evaluated at this time. Whatever our final judgment may be, we must reach it in docket 8008. Because I am unwilling to assume answers to the issues before the Board, and because of my analysis of the air transportation cost and traffic conditions which have so heavily influenced the majority, I cannot agree, on the evidence before the Board, that an interim fare increase is justified at this time. My remarks are neither intended, nor to be construed, as a disposition or tendency toward disposition of issues in docket 8008. My opinion in that case will be based on the evidence there adduced.

INTRODUCTION

In the 6-percent case, decided last fall, this Board determined that the reported depression in then current airline earnings was not indicative of long-term trends. We found, accordingly, that traffic and cost conditions did not justify an "emergency" fare increase⁷ prior to complete evaluation of airline fare levels in docket 8008. In so holding, we reaffirmed the statutory ratemaking standards to which this Board had alluded in dismissing its earlier general passenger fare investigation,⁸ noting particularly the Board's earlier statements that "fare levels should not be shifted to meet each swing of the pendulum."⁹

"... should earnings fall markedly in the future the carriers will be expected to absorb such losses without resort to fare or mail rate adjustments unless it can be demonstrated that such earnings are below the level necessary to provide a fair return over a reasonably extended period which includes the good years as well as the bad."¹⁰

Based on these considerations, we concluded that—

"We have, therefore, carefully reviewed the evidence of record and the contentions of the parties in the light of the ratemaking standards set forth above and find and conclude upon the basis thereof that a fare increase is not justified."¹¹

If we can assume that the Board now holds the same views on ratemaking, interim or otherwise, that were expressed in the 6-percent case, we must examine those facts which are now available to us to determine whether there have been changes in cost and traffic conditions which may be properly evaluated as representing long-term trends.

In the absence of evidence, in the Administrative Procedure Act sense,¹² and on the

basis of information which has been gathered as the result of the "continuing surveillance"¹³ of fare levels which has been maintained by this Board, I see no change in traffic growth, unit costs, or other transportation condition which justifies a fare increase at this time.

TRAFFIC TRENDS AND RELATED MATTERS

The majority's evaluation of the trunklines' long-term economic trends appear greatly influenced by what it perceives to be a distinct downturn in rate of traffic growth, coupled with a concurrent decline in general business conditions.

While I don't know the full extent to which the majority's forecast has been influenced by the current general business recession, I will readily agree that generally airline traffic and profit behavior are affected by national economic patterns. Unquestionably, for example, the decline in general corporate profits which commenced in 1956¹⁴ roughly parallels the history of this industry over the same period, as the majority's return-on-investment table¹⁵ discloses at a glance. Certainly, too, the general economic decline in 1957's fourth quarter is reflected in the reduced fourth quarter earnings of the air transport industry. But while in the broad sense the patterns are related, at least one highly significant dissimilarity between air transport and general economic trends is evident here, viz: standard economic indices¹⁶ reflect a regularly increasing decline in the general economy, while airline traffic has increased, although at an irregular rate.

For this reason, as well as for others hereinafter discussed, I cannot accept the majority's analysis of recent traffic developments as representing a consistent downturn in traffic growth. The information available to this Board, at the time of issuance of its order denying reconsideration in the 6 percent case,¹⁷ showed a decline in percentage of traffic growth for September and October over growth in the same months for 1956. From an increase of 17.0 percent for August, percentages of growth declined to 10.4 percent for September, and 7.2 percent for October. Since the issuance of our order, however, and prior to the formulation of the majority's tentative decision here,¹⁸ we observed a slight increase in percentage of traffic growth to 8.1 percent for November, as compared with October's 7.2 percent growth, and, on the basis of preliminary

orders be supported by and in accordance with "reliable probative and substantial evidence," standards which have, through Congressional and judicial interpretation, an explicit and well defined meaning. Obviously, however, where emergency economic conditions exist, this Board has an affirmative duty, consistent with due process and statutory requisites, to "fashion the tools" for performing its statutory functions [cf. *California v. United States* (320 U. S. 577, 584 (1943))], and need not employ more exact but more time-consuming methods of fact-finding. I joined in directing an informal, continuing assessment of airline earnings and consider such an action defensible under the circumstances stated to exist. I point out, however, that the quality of information adduced under such circumstances generally, and in this particular instance, falls far short of the statutory standard. The information must, accordingly, be evaluated in the light of its obvious infirmities.

¹³ CAB press release of August 8, 1957, announcing the Board's tentative vote in the 6 percent case.

¹⁴ Economic Report of the President, January 1958, at p. 26.

¹⁵ Majority opinion, p. 5.

¹⁶ Federal Reserve Board Index of Industrial Production; railroad freight-car loadings.

¹⁷ Order No. E-12092, January 8, 1958.

¹⁸ CAB press release dated January 24, 1958.

¹ See majority opinion and order, note 3.

² Order No. E-11812, Sept. 25, 1957; reconsideration denied, Order No. E-12092, Jan. 8, 1958.

³ Docket No. 8008.

⁴ The Place of Air Travel in the Travel Market, John B. Lansing, selected findings of 1955 National Travel Market, reported to the Travel Research Association, November 1956; Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; table 2 of the same source reveals that only 30 percent of adult Americans have never taken a rail trip.

⁵ The average American family income in 1955 was \$4,421. In contrast, the average family income of adult commercial air travelers in the same year was \$10,000; The Place of Air Travel in the Travel Market, table 5.

⁶ H. R. 7125, a bill to that effect, has been offered in this session of Congress.

⁷ Ibid., p. 40.

⁸ Order No. E-7376, May 14, 1953.

⁹ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 10.

¹¹ Six-percent case, supra, p. 9.

¹² Section 7 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act requires that administrative

statistics then available, a substantial 13.5 percent increase for December 1957 over December 1956.¹⁹ Thus, while we had observed a distinct 2-month downward traffic trend prior to denial of petitions for reconsideration in the 6 percent case, the later information available to us at the time this fare increase was granted by the majority established an upward trend in traffic growth for the last 2 months of 1957, a surprising showing of resistance to the general economic trend.

While obviously a pair of 2-month trends are, by any measure, inconclusive,²⁰ the essence of our enunciated cyclical ratemaking standards is our unwillingness to fix future fares on such short-term indicia. As we have repeatedly indicated, the long-term averaging and evaluation of the peaks and valleys in this relatively volatile industry requires demonstration, rather than assumption, of trends.²¹ No such demonstration was evident in the 6-percent case. No such demonstration is evident here.

Assuming, as does the majority, that the current recession will be of fairly long duration, the estimate of the existing challenge to our economic policies set forth in the economic report of the President, January 1958, at page 53, is noteworthy:

"There are critical questions here for the leadership of business and labor, as well as for government. Business concerns must reexamine their policies and practices. Price increases that are unwarranted by costs or that attempt to recapture investment outlays too quickly not only lower the purchasing power of the dollar but may be self-defeating by causing a restriction of markets, lower output, underutilization of capacity, and a narrowing of the return on capital investment."

The language points up the growth-discouraging factors inherent in price increases during periods of economic recession. In terms of air transportation, a carrier's revenue requirements depend upon traffic, which, in turn, is directly affected by the level of fares assessed. The relationship between fares and traffic is obviously increased in times of increasing consumer price consciousness and the resultant traffic decreasing tendencies must be offset, under sound pricing policies, by traffic-stimulating methods.

At least one carrier has recently recognized the relationship between fares and traffic growth. The president of National Airlines, Inc., in accepting the Board's January 24, 1958, offer to approve specified fare increases, stated:

"By no stretch of the imagination can this increase be considered a satisfactory solution

to the problems which the airlines face today. The airlines need more traffic in order to produce more revenue. An increase in fares, at a time when industry load factors are declining, is contrary to good business judgment."

Contrasting another method of increasing carrier revenues, he indicated that unlike the fare increase, the alternative method would not price air transportation out of any part of the existing market.²²

These concepts appear to have been more widely shared in the recent past. On August 10, 1953, the statement of Mr. J. D. Durand, secretary and assistant general counsel, Air Transport Association of America, before the House Ways and Means Committee, reveals that:

"The most powerful stimulus to the enlargement of the airline fleet would be a continuing increase in the volume of air traffic. The earnings which such an increase would create would, likewise, greatly help the airlines in financing the purchase of the equipment necessary to keep the fleet a modern one. Repeal of the 15-percent tax with the resulting 15-percent reduction in the price of air transportation, would help tremendously in generating the volume of traffic which the industry needs if it is to meet the defense requirements set for it."²³

If further evidence of the relationship between fare levels and traffic volume were needed, we need only look to "What We Need is a Good Three-Cent Airline," an article by American Airlines' C. R. Smith, published in the October 20, 1945 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. There, the author quoted many practical, qualified commentators on the future of air transportation as agreeing that—

"First, we need an airline fleet so big that it constitutes an adequate reserve for national air power. Thousands of airliners, not hundreds. Second, fares must be cut down to the pocketbook level of the average citizen. Volume business will result."

Today, far more than in 1953 or in 1945, the effect of prices on traffic is a critical question facing the Board and the industry. Not only is today's rate of equipment addition far outstripping actual or anticipated rates of traffic growth, but the greatly accelerated growth of capacity which will commence with delivery of turbine-powered transports will swell the problem to crisis proportions. This is the second and major aspect of the phase-over to jet aircraft, the aspect which has been given little public scrutiny.

The first or jet problem may be great. The second problem, that of filling the huge number of present and anticipated additional seats, is greater.

Clearly, as indicated earlier herein, the segment of the general public which must be converted to air transportation is the same segment which is most sensitive to

¹⁹ Preliminary data furnished by the Air Transport Association of America on January 13, 1958, indicated a 13.5 percent traffic increase for December 1957 over December 1956. Regularly reported statistics not available until February 14, 1958, showed a 15 percent increase for December. It may well be argued that a portion of the increase is illusory, in terms of real increase, in view of the poor prevailing weather in the Northeast during much of December 1956. When we add to this factor, however, the exceptionally poor weather for Florida-bound tourists in December 1957, it is clear that December's increase is, under any standard, substantial.

²⁰ Analysis of 1955, 1956, and 1957 September through December traffic in terms of absolute traffic volume rather than percentage of growth establishes that a declining traffic volume for the months September, October, and November, and a volume increase for December are normal. While the September, October, and November declines in traffic volume were greater in 1957 than in the 2 preceding years, so also was December's increase.

²¹ Original general passenger fare investigation (supra) at p. 10; 6-percent case (supra), p. 8.

²² Bureau Counsel Exhibit, BRC-190, Docket 8008.

price increases. The price sensitivity of any group, however, is magnified during periods of general economic recession such as these. This general sensitivity is readily evident in the traffic results for the late 1957 period evaluated by the majority.

Examining these data, we find that the percentage of total traffic increase for the domestic trunks from the corresponding month in the preceding year varied, as hereinabove noted, from 10.4 percent and 7.2 percent to 8.1 percent respectively, for September, October, and November 1957, while the ratio of coach to first class growth increased at a rate similar to arithmetic progression. In September, the 7.1 gain in first-class revenue passenger miles compared with a 15-percent increase in coach travel, a more than 1-to-2 ratio. October's figures revealed a 4 percent increase in first class and a 13.6 percent increase in coach, slightly over a 1 to 3 ratio. Finally, November's 3.8 percent first class improvement was offset by a 16.2 percent increase in coach, approximately a 1-to-4 ratio.

Obviously, no arithmetically progressive ratio between first class and coach travel growth can be anticipated over an extended period. However, this is at least as accurate a measure of fourth quarter trends as that perceived by the majority. A more precise rate of decline could have been spelled out by the majority in the unbroken rate of decline in first-class traffic growth in the base period selected. Thus, during September, October, and November, domestic trunkline first-class traffic growth steadily declined from 7.1 percent, 4.0 percent to 3.8. Most significantly, during November's continued rate of first-class traffic growth decline, November's total traffic growth improved over October's, due entirely to the substantial coach growth during the month.

Traffic results for calendar year 1957 show an extension of the trend to coach travel over a broad base. In January 1957, domestic trunkline first-class and coach traffic growth rates were approximately equal, being 14.3 percent and 15.5 percent greater, respectively, than corresponding traffic in the preceding January. By December 1957, the first-class coach ratio changed from 1-1 to 1-2, since first class increased only 10.4 percent compared with a 22.3 percent coach increase. The disproportionate coach growth trend in 1957 is even more dramatically illustrated by traffic results of "other trunks" since March 1957. In that month, first class and coach growth bore a 2-1 ratio to each other. By December 1957, however, first class and coach traffic grew in a 1-3 ratio, a 6-fold increase in the relationship of coach to first-class growth.

These traffic results point clearly to heightened user price resistance. More significantly, however, they indicate that the resistance may be manifesting itself through diversion from higher to lower priced airline travel, rather than from air to surface travel, and this has occurred during periods when many markets have been offered apparently inadequate levels of coach service.²⁴ Because of these indications, I deeply regret the failure of the carriers and the

²⁴ Other than American, Eastern, TWA, and United.

²⁵ November 1, 1957 schedules for many leading markets reveal relatively few day coach vis-a-vis first-class flights, as illustrated by the following examples:

Segment	Segment rank	1st class	Day coach
Boston-New York	3	104	15
Detroit-New York	7	72	14
Cleveland-New York	8	54	6
Buffalo-New York	9	62	0
New York-Pittsburgh	10	66	6
Chicago-St. Louis	16	47	2

majority to restrict the interim fare adjustments to first-class fare increases, assuming that some increase is required at this time. It's true that the maintenance of coach fares in status quo would not in itself assist in tapping new mass markets unless the disparity between air and surface fares is reduced by surface fare increases. Such an action, however, would avoid loss of existing markets and assist in maintaining historic rates of traffic growth now, when continued growth in this category of air travel is so necessary.

Equally regrettable is the failure of the carriers or the majority to devise or suggest methods for reaching heretofore untapped markets. The mutual passenger and carrier benefits to be derived therefrom are clear; attractive pricing to the public means more passengers and more revenue for the carrier.

COST INCREASES

This industry, it is true, as any other, has been required to pay ever-mounting costs, in labor and equipment, since 1938. As in any other industry, however, it is the cost of producing the salable unit which determines its price. In spite of regularly increasing labor and equipment costs, air transportation's unit cost norm, the available ton-mile, has declined since 1938, due to increased volume and the improved efficiency of equipment and labor.²⁸

Appendix B to the majority opinion indicates, however, that during the year ended November 30, 1957, the average available ton-mile costs of the 12 trunklines rose to 26.71 cents as compared with 26.36 cents per available ton-mile for the year ended June 30, 1957. While a simple recital of these averages appears to indicate that the long trend toward lower unit costs has now been reversed, the apparent increase stands up poorly on examination. The same appendix indicates that the available ton-mile costs of 8 of the 12 carriers were lower in the year ended November 30 than they had been for the year ended June 30. While 3 of the remaining 4 carriers suffered relatively insignificant increases, Eastern shows a tremendous increase in the later period, an increase of 1.66 cents per available ton-mile. It is, of course, difficult, prior to the full scrutiny of docket 8008, to isolate the causes of Eastern's reported cost increases. It is highly unlikely, however, that the general economic factors which affect air transportation costs would single out Eastern to the relative exclusion of all other trunklines. Sound analysis requires, therefore, that Eastern's costs be eliminated from the trunkline average for these purposes. Having done so, we find that the average available ton-mile costs of the 11 trunklines actually declined from 27.49 cents for the year ended June 30, 1957, to 27.45 cents for the year ended November 30, 1957, a continuance of the general, though occasionally fluctuating, trend which has been evident since 1938. Thus, ironically enough, only by including the costs of a carrier which reported a 10.2 percent return on investment for the year ended November 30, 1957, may we conclude that there has been any general industry increase in available ton-mile costs since the close of the record in the 6-percent case. Certainly if fares had been based on Eastern's operating results over the years, fares would now be lower, not higher, than the January 24, 1958 level.

²⁸ Declining unit cost trends are not confined to the air transportation industry. See, for example, Regulation of Public Utilities in New York State annual report for the year 1956, at p. 7: "While there have been minor rate adjustments, upward or downward, for electric service during the year, the vast majority of residential consumers in the State were paying less per kilowatt-hour in 1956 than they paid in 1940."

Even if we look at long-term forecasts, a matter which will be considered in docket 8008, no rising cost trend can be established at this time. Significantly, those carriers which have submitted 5 year available ton-mile cost forecasts project a slight increase for 1958 and a declining cost pattern thereafter. While obviously we cannot now reach a judgment on the probable accuracy of these forecasts, the predictions clearly run counter to the assumption of future cost increases made by the majority.

RATE OF RETURN

The foregoing discussion has been premised on the assumption that the majority decision here follows, in every respect, the rationale adopted in the 6 percent case and in the earlier General Passenger Fare Investigation.²⁹

This assumption is unwarranted. A different and higher rate of return standard than that employed in the 6 percent case has been used by the majority. In that case, we declined to depart from the historical 8 percent return standard, stating that "the record in this proceeding would not support the use of any other rate of return."³⁰

Our factual knowledge of the matter has not been improved since that time. We do not have, as yet, an adequate basis for determining the amount of return on investment required to stimulate the desirable degree of investor confidence. Our "continuing surveillance" has failed to produce sufficient evidence of the compatibility of anticipated aircraft acquisitions with realistic traffic forecasts, particularly as affected by proposed fare increases. In short, in these and other respects, we had no more rate of return evidence before us on the date of our decision here than we had in the 6 percent case.

It is true that bureau counsel has introduced in evidence (exhibit BC-120), in docket 8008, a document entitled, "A report on a fair and reasonable rate of return for domestic trunkline carriers," on the basis of which the Bureau, in that proceeding, advocates rates of return of 8.9 percent and 9.45 percent for the Big Four and the remaining trunkline carriers respectively. This, however, is hardly the record support considered necessary in the 6 percent case. It must be recognized, too, that the exhibit was prepared at the height of the tight money market. Indisputably, the actions recently taken and planned by the Federal Reserve Board for the purpose of liberalizing credit have had an effect on this exhibit as it relates to today's cost of capital. I cannot assume that these preliminary indications permit making any definitive downward adjustment to this capital cost study. The inability to make definitive adjustments at this time, however, in no way derogates from the fact that the exhibit is necessarily outmoded. We cannot, therefore, rely on the exhibit for these interim purposes.

Another reason for applying the standards of the 6 percent case exists as well. Prior to any real examination of the question, the majority has, in practical effect, forever precluded a return to the historical 8 percent standard, having now accepted the 9.45 percent and 8.9 percent standards as minimums. As a practical matter, additional rate of return adjustments, if any, will necessarily take an upward turn. In my view, we have no basis whatsoever on which to prejudice the later and full examination of the problem which must be made at the conclusion of the fare investigation currently in progress.

Assuming for the moment, however, that the Board properly applied a higher rate-of-return standard in advance of a genuine

analysis of the question, the application has been heavy-handed here.

The additional revenues which would have accrued³¹ during the 12-month period ended November 30, 1957, had the 6.6 percent increase been in effect during that period, would have produced unadjusted rates of return of 11 percent and 9.3 percent for the Big Four and other eight trunks respectively. Bearing in mind the Board's cyclical ratemaking standards and recognizing this period of relatively depressed earnings as a point on the lower half of the cycle, the particular effects of the hypothetical 1957 increase bears examination. In the Big Four, for example, Eastern would have earned 15.7 percent on its reported investment, American, a respectable 12.1 percent, and United, 10.2 percent, all well above the standard set here by the majority for the good years as well as for the bad.

But as the majority notes, these are unadjusted figures. Application of those adjustments which reflect existing Board rate policy, that is, eliminating equipment deposit funds from the investment base and reflecting depreciation on the basis of a 7-year life and a 15 percent residual value, produces substantially different results. Thus, Eastern's 15.7 percent return becomes 21.6 percent, American's 12.1 percent becomes 18 percent, and United's 10.2 percent is converted to 12 percent. These, judged by the results of earlier years, are substantial returns and appear entirely incompatible with the "too-little-and-too-late" statements attributed to industry spokesmen.³²

In any event, both the reported and the adjusted returns are inconsistent with reported intended requests for further interim fare increases.³³

The majority has softened the effect of the unadjusted 11 percent and 9.3 percent rates of return, hereinbefore discussed, by forecasting an unspecified reduction in these rates of return for 1958. A reduction, it is said, is indicated by the marked downturn in traffic growth in the latter part of 1957, the general business decline, and the recent increase in available ton-mile costs.³⁴

These factors have been analyzed earlier in this opinion and are rejected for the reasons previously given. It is ironic, however, that the foreseen marked downturn in traffic growth may yet occur because of the retarding effects of this fare increase.

LOAD FACTORS

It is evident from the foregoing (a) that 1957 domestic trunkline traffic increased 13.2 percent over 1956 traffic, a greater rate of increase than that recorded in 1956 over the previous year (12.5 percent) or for the year ended June 30, 1957 (12.6 percent), and (b) that unit costs show a recent decrease when we eliminate the atypical and presently inexplicable rise in available ton-mile costs of Eastern, the trunkline with the second highest rate of return for 1957. It is abundantly clear, then, that continued unabated excesses of capacity growth over traffic growth are almost solely responsible for the carriers' declining earnings.³⁵

³⁰ Assuming no traffic decline because of the fare increase.

³¹ See New York Journal of Commerce, February 10, 1958, indicating that "The airlines claim the 6.6 percent . . . is 'too little and too late.'"

³² The same article referred to in the footnote next above reports Eastern's intention to seek a further interim increase prior to the conclusion of docket 8008.

³³ An anticipated increase in the carriers' investment base for 1958 was mentioned as an additional factor in the majority's forecast.

³⁴ The problem is graphically illustrated by the following comparison of traffic growth

²⁹ Order No. E-7376, May 14, 1953.

³⁰ 6 percent case, p. 15.

Here, however, as in its treatment of the rate-of-return problem, the majority has taken a position sharply different from that expressed in the 6 percent case, where we stated at pages 32 and 33:

"The carriers argue that . . . all schedules should be recognized for ratemaking purposes. The carriers' contention would lead to frustration of rate regulation."

[In percent]

Period	Growth over preceding year		Reported average rate of return
	Revenue passenger miles	Available seat miles	
1955.....	18	17	11.6
1956.....	12.5	12.4	9.4
Year ended June 30, 1957.....	12.6	16.8	8.0
Calendar 1957.....	13.2	18	15.7

¹ Year ended Nov. 30, 1957. The excellent December 1957 traffic results are not included.

Despite finger-wagging admonishment, the majority, unlike in the 6 percent case opinion,³⁴ has necessarily reached a different conclusion, since it has granted a fare increase to provide an unadjusted 10.5 percent rate of return on all of the carriers' capacity. Its disclaimer of ability to consider load factor problems at this time,³⁵ then, is as surprising as it is unimpressive, for this is the crux of the problem.

In justification for basing fares on actual capacity, it has been argued that load factor problems are best considered in a full hearing. While I accept the statement as indisputably true in normal circumstances, here the majority has decided all the issues before the board without hearing. Having informally resolved in favor of the trunklines and against the interest of the traveling public, those issues which appear, to the majority, to support a fare increase, it is indefensible to refuse to consider informally the capacity problem, for this is the pivotal issue in the case, the issue which most strongly militates against a fare increase at this time.

If, as the majority suggests, interim fares are to reflect actual capacity, then the car-

versus capacity growth during the period evaluated by the majority for rate of return purposes.

"In the 6 percent case, in noting the effect of new competition, we stated at page 30:

"In our judgment such circumstances do not justify a fare increase. We have never considered experimentation with schedules for a reasonable period of time to be uneconomical or inefficient management; on the other hand, the adverse effect (that) such experimentation may have on a carrier's earnings does not support a fare increase. It is a temporary condition which we have every confidence a carrier will overcome under honest, economical and efficient management, once it has sufficient information available to determine the needs of the market in light of the new competition."

See also language at p. 31 when we indicated:

"We wish to make it clear that management has the obligation to tailor schedules to the need of the market once sufficient experience has been gained to determine the need. It has been and continues to be the board's view that load factors are controllable by management to a large degree, particularly in an expanding market."

³⁵ The Board indicates, at p. 13, that it would not be inclined to grant another increase without examining the load factor problem. No justification is given for the total inconsistency in approach between this and future proceedings.

riers, who alone control capacity levels, are the sole arbiters of fare levels. Further capacity increases prior to the conclusion of docket 8008, under these circumstances, will automatically call for another upward fare adjustment. But it is the Board, not the carriers, which is statutorily charged with judging the reasonableness of fare levels upon such criteria, *inter alia*, as:

"(1) The effect of such rates upon the movement of traffic;

"(2) The need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation of persons and property by air carriers at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service."³⁶

Clearly these standards are at odds with the ratemaking theories adopted by the majority.

It is noteworthy that the carriers, in docket 8008, forecast approximately balancing percentages of traffic and capacity growth for the year 1958. While I doubt that the forecast will be achieved in the manner stated,³⁷ the fact that the carriers forecast a balanced traffic-capacity growth is encouraging to the extent that it may reflect increased carrier concern over the capacity problem.

I conclude that the same excess capacity, considered by the Board in the 6 percent case to be "controllable . . . to a large degree,"³⁸ has continued unabated in the latter half of 1957. The condition has been almost solely responsible for the decline in earnings experienced since the close of the record in the 6-percent case. Since excesses of capacity growth did not justify a fare increase in the 6-percent case, they are entitled to no greater weight here.

SUMMARY

My evaluation of the information available on January 24, 1958 leads me to the inevitable conclusion that traffic results and available ton-mile cost trends since the close of the record in the 6-percent case establish no basis for an interim fare increase. Excluding Eastern's atypical unit cost increases, available ton-mile costs for the trunkline have declined. Traffic, after an exceptionally successful July and August, decreased at a sharply reduced rate in September and October. Traffic recovered slightly in November, however, and substantially in December to record a greater total traffic increase for calendar 1957 than for the preceding year. Load factors and reported return on investment declined in the latter half of the year as a direct result of continued increases in available capacity at rates greatly in excess of actual or anticipated traffic growth.

It is clear, therefore, that an erroneous evaluation of cost and traffic trends, as well as departures from the Board's previous interim ratemaking standards, have led to grant of this fare increase. In contrast to the standards of the 6 percent case and in the face of less evidence than was held inadequate in that proceeding, the majority now: (1) Accepts actual capacity for ratemaking purposes; (2) permits higher than an 8 percent return on investment prior to completion of any real examination of the cost-of-capital problem; (3) evaluates return on investment solely by reported results; and (4) bases fare adjustments on results of the poorer years without effectively considering results of prior more successful years.

³⁶ Section 1002 (e) Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

³⁷ The 1958 projected traffic growth if achieved will exceed traffic growth achieved in 1957, 1956, and 1954. The relationship to prior recent results, the absence of suggested traffic-stimulating methods, and the probable effects of this fare increase cast doubt on the accuracy of the traffic forecast.

³⁸ Note 32, *supra*.

Stated another way, the majority has resolved all doubts in favor of the carriers and against the individual passenger. Had this been our approach last summer, the 6 percent case would necessarily have reached a different result.

I am most concerned about the future effect of this action, for the greatest increases in airline capacity are yet to come. The adverse effect which this and possible future interim fare increases will have on today's passengers, as well as the vast majority of Americans who have never flown, may be disastrous. The tendency to price all categories of air transportation out of reach of a significant segment of the general public may signal a reversal of the recent diversion from surface to air travel and may constitute the first step toward a return to Federal subsidy.

I repeat my earlier statement that these remarks are not to be construed as a tendency to prejudice issues in docket 8008 or elsewhere. I remain completely openminded and receptive to problems and proposed remedies that may appear in that docket and thereafter. I cannot, at this time, however, for reasons hereinabove stated, approve the interim fare increase offered by my colleagues.

G. JOSEPH MINETTI.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his graciousness.

RETIREMENT OF HOWARD HOPKINS, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF FOREST SERVICE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on June 30, Mr. Howard Hopkins, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, will retire from the Federal Government. Mr. Hopkins is closing a career of more than 35 years of unselfish public service, 35 years devoted to the development and conservation of our Nation's forests, soil, and waters.

Howard Hopkins' career has been as colorful and fruitful as it has been long. In 1923 he started with the Forest Service as a forest assistant in Colorado. Then he became a forest supervisor in Minnesota, an assistant regional forester in the Eastern United States, and then an associate regional forester in California. For several years he was very active in the cooperative programs of the Department of Agriculture with State and private forestry organizations and other groups, working to expand fire protection and to bring other good forestry measures to State and private lands. During World War II, Mr. Hopkins was in charge of the timber production for war project. His leadership helped to make it possible for our boys to get the lumber and paper and other forest products they needed to win the war. He helped keep the axes and saws going and the mills operating here at home.

Since 1947, Mr. Hopkins has been Assistant Chief of the Forest Service. In this position he has directed programs set up by the Weeks law and other acts of Congress to consolidate the national forests through purchase and exchange of lands, so that they will better serve the people of the United States.

Through these Congressional programs with which he has been associated, the national forests have assumed greater and greater economic and spiritual importance. Watershed protection has been increased. Tree planting and tim-

ber production have been stepped up. More lands have been made available to the public for hunting, fishing, camping, and other recreation. It has been demonstrated that scientific forest management on a large scale is practical. The success and value of modern forestry practices in building and maintaining prosperous pulp and paper, lumber, and other forest industries has been convincingly demonstrated. There is proof of this in the great forest producing areas of the South and in many other parts of the Nation. The national forests have played an important part in bringing this about.

As a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which passes upon national forest land purchase and exchange programs, I have had the pleasure of working closely with Howard Hopkins for many years. The work of developing, consolidating, and adjusting the national forests so that they will contribute the greatest amount of public benefit is a challenging one. Mr. Hopkins has carried out this work with splendid competence, rare imagination, the highest integrity, and a resolute dedication to the public good. In my humble opinion, the national forests are better public properties, and the American people have a finer heritage, because of Howard Hopkins' career of public service. I know that my colleagues on the National Forest Reservation Commission join me in openly expressing to him our appreciation of the fine work in forest conservation that he has done. He represents the very highest in official service and the very finest in integrity.

Young men in the Forest Service have told me they have patterned and planned their official service and professional careers along the lines followed by this fine gentleman, Mr. Hopkins.

I have in my office a small gavel made from a limb of a very old pine tree, a tree said to be the oldest living thing in the world and estimated to be 4,600 years of age. I have told Mr. Hopkins that the good which will come from his work in the national forests will live longer than that tree has already lived.

I am glad to pay him this tribute as he retires, and to wish him the many satisfactions which he so well deserves.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I join with the Senator from Mississippi in paying the very highest tribute to the life and extraordinary public service of this outstanding man. He has had the great vision, ability, and energy to follow through and get things done in a most important field of our American life.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thought it might be particularly appropriate, as a Senator from the State of New York, if I were to say a few words about Alaskan statehood, inasmuch as I gather

from statements made during the course of the debate in the Senate that, inasmuch as Alaska is small in terms of population, New York, which has a large population, might have some reluctance in seeing Alaska admitted to full equality in terms of representation in this august body.

Mr. President, as one of the Senators from the State of New York, I feel that an historic opportunity is presented to the Senate to vote statehood for Alaska—the first State to be admitted which is separated from continental United States. The vital interests of our country—economic and social, as well as national defense-interests—require that this be done.

I am especially concerned by the implications to our foreign policy of the admission of Alaska to the Union. It will picture for the people of the rest of the world the enlarged horizon of the people of the United States when they are willing to admit to statehood an area which is separated from continental United States by 515 miles by land and 750 miles by sea; and the admission of Alaska to statehood will show that every American has deep in his heart an all-pervasive commitment for the defense and security of every part of our country. The admission of Alaska to statehood, thus removing it from the experimental or interim stage of Territorial status, will represent to the rest of the world the indissoluble bond between the people of Alaska and those of the present 48 States. The admission of Alaska to statehood will serve notice on the Soviet Union that the people of the United States have unlimited faith in their own strength and purpose, and that they unhesitatingly commit their country's policy to statehood for an area which is only 55 miles across the Bering Straits from the land mass of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as statehood for Alaska is an historic event, it is also an historic opportunity in connection with the foreign policy of the United States. The implications of the admission of Alaska and the ultimate admission of Hawaii to statehood will be clear to all the world as being a part of our solemn covenant under the United Nations Charter, our fidelity to our responsibilities under the network of treaties in the Pacific, Asia, and Australia, and New Zealand, and our determination that there shall be no successful aggression in the world or no surrender of free peoples to force or subversion.

The admission of Alaska was a plank in the platform on which I ran for the office of Senator of the United States. I believed in that platform then, and I intend to honor it now.

Mr. President, during the debate on yesterday, one distinguished Senator noted the fact that Alaska, with only 220,000 people, will have the same representation which the State of New York has with a population—as stated during the debate on yesterday—of more than 15 million. As a matter of fact, New York has a population of more than 16 million. Certainly that is a strange argument to come from Senators who

for so long have zealously defended equal sovereignty and Senate power on the part of each State, regardless of size.

As a Senator from New York, I would welcome the addition of the two Senators from Alaska; and I believe that represents an enormous body of opinion in my State, because I consider it to be in the national interest. Each new State increases by so much the power and the effectiveness of the United States. Therefore, it increases by its proportion of the whole the power and effectiveness of any State. Inasmuch as my State is the largest in the Union, population-wise, I feel that it will obtain the greatest benefit from the admission of Alaska.

Senators serve in this body to represent their States and the Nation—a composite of all we consider best in our society. Senators do not serve here to represent any personal power or influence. We, as Senators, are as strong as the United States, not as the individuals who make up the Senate for the time being. Vital as it is—and it is vital—to have able, dedicated Senators, such Senators can come from Alaska as well as from New York; and all our history shows that to be so.

Mr. President, even today there are a number of States with a population of less than half a million. For example, Nevada, which is the 6th largest State in terms of land area, ranks 48th in population. In 1956, Nevada had a population of approximately 270,000, or only slightly more than the population of Alaska. Yet no Member of the Senate has risen to complain of the representation in the Senate from the less populated States.

Alaska is an incorporated Territory which derives its organization from the act of 1912. Together with Hawaii, Alaska is 1 of the 2 remaining incorporated Territories which have not achieved statehood. Alaska occupies a position similar to that occupied by the Territories of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico prior to their admission to the Union.

Under the Organic Act of Alaska, the Governor is appointed by the President; and although Alaska has elected representatives for local government, certain legislative power, normally incident to State government, is reserved to the United States Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, Alaska has no elected representative in either House of Congress, although a nonvoting Delegate is elected. Not only are the residents of Alaska deprived of the right to vote for Congressional representation, but they also have no voice in the election of the President of the United States. Furthermore, they are judged by Federal judges, not State-elected judges; and they are hampered from the internal development of their area to the full which would come from having adequate public lands under local control. In addition, the people of Alaska lack the encouragement, the morale, and the enthusiasm for their area which statehood would bring.

Mr. President, I think that is the most important argument of all. Americans

are fond of the great play, Oklahoma, which was developed in New York. Why is Oklahoma a great play? It is because it pictorializes in drama the emotion, the excitement, the enthusiasm, and the encouragement which come to the individual citizen when the area in which he lives finally becomes a State, thus giving him new and enlarged opportunity and substantial status as a citizen in his own right.

I hope and pray that the Senate is about to push the button which really will unlock and release the majesty and enthusiasm of the whole population of Alaska by enabling them to become full-fledged citizens of the United States. When we grant them statehood, they will really go places.

So it is that, in this connection, I like to think of the show Oklahoma, because that show, in our day, has pictured for us how the people of the Territory of Oklahoma felt when they obtained statehood.

Mr. President, realistically we must acknowledge that the amendments which will be offered to the bill and the technical objections which have been raised to it, will, if adopted or if they are sustained, have the effect of endangering any chance for the enactment of such legislation at this session.

I intend to vote against all amendments which really would have the effect of killing the bill.

For more than 40 years the Congress has been debating the proposal for statehood for Alaska. Alaska has been a part of the United States for 83 years. No other Territory has had to wait for so long a period of time before being admitted into the Union.

So, Mr. President, I hope to have the historic privilege of being a part of the vote in this body which will admit Alaska to statehood now; and I hazard the guess that it will be one of the most exciting things that has happened to this country in a very, very long time.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MITCHEL AIR FORCE BASE— RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion in the RECORD of a resolution from the United Veterans Organization with relation to the operation of the Mitchel Air Force Base in Nassau County, N. Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1958.

Whereas the United Veterans Organization of Nassau County, N. Y., which is comprised of 10 member-county veteran organizations, namely (1) United Spanish War Veterans; (2) Veterans of Foreign Wars; (3) American Legion; (4) Disabled American Veterans; (5) Jewish War Veterans; (6) Catholic War Veterans; (7) Marine Corps League; (8) National Guard Veterans; (9) Reserve Officers Association of the United States; (10) Masonic War Veterans; and

Whereas the United Veterans Organization of Nassau County has watched with increasing alarm the current one-sided publicity campaign and efforts of those who

claim to speak for the majority in seeking the moving of Mitchel Air Force Base; and

Whereas it is believed the majority of all concerned are not in favor of moving Mitchel Air Force Base. The United Veterans Organization of Nassau County has polled its member organizations to ascertain the feeling of their collective membership; and

Whereas the desire of the United Veterans Organization and its member organizations is 100 percent in favor of the retention of Mitchel Air Force Base at its present location; and

Whereas the need for Mitchel Air Force Base as a vital component of our national defense, its need for the training of the Reserve Air Force units, its need for the operation and maintenance of its communications system covering the eastern seaboard, its need as the most important Air Force Base in the New York metropolitan area, its contribution to the economic welfare of Nassau County with its employment of 5,000 military and 1,800 civilian employees, with its \$30 million annual payroll, its contribution of approximately \$500,000 in Federal aid to local schools, and its \$10 million in local purchases and contracts, and its contribution to the training of Civil Air Patrol units and the open door policy of conducting exhibitions and educational programs for Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and the general public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United Veterans Organization of Nassau County, do hereby unanimously resolve to go on record as being definitely opposed to the moving of Mitchel Air Force Base from its present location, and directs that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Air Force in order that those who have the authority for the decision as to the removal or retention of the base will have the benefit of the thinking of the United Veterans Organization of Nassau County, and its member organizations whose combined individual membership of veterans is approximately 24,000 representing 135 veterans posts.

GEORGE L. ROMIG,
President, United Veterans Organi-
zation of Nassau County, N. Y.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been a cosponsor in the last 4 Congresses of legislation providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. Of course, I am delighted that the Senate now has the opportunity to end this long controversy within the next few days by favorable action on the pending measure, which has already passed the House of Representatives.

I do not desire to take the time of the Senate to make a lengthy statement, but I do want to make a few brief remarks and to insert in the RECORD editorials from various Florida newspapers indicating what, in my opinion, is the attitude of the majority of the people of my State on the subject of statehood for Alaska.

Four of my eight colleagues from Florida in the House of Representatives took polls in their Districts on the question of statehood for Alaska. In one of the Districts the poll favored statehood by a margin of a little better than 3 to 2.

In another of the Districts polled, 67.8 percent of those replying to the questionnaire favored statehood. A third showed 69 percent in favor of statehood, and in the fourth and last District polled, 89 percent favored statehood for Alaska.

In 2 of the remaining 4 Congressional Districts of Florida, one of which includes Jacksonville and the other Miami, the Representatives from such Districts voted in favor of statehood for Alaska, indicating that they felt, as I feel, that their people favored such action, although they had not polled them on the question.

Mr. President, as stated above, a further indication of the attitude of the people of Florida on this matter is to be found in editorials from various representative newspapers in the State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks several editorials bearing on this question, and I shall quote briefly from some of these editorials as I offer them for the RECORD.

The first editorial, entitled "Alaska Statehood Long Overdue," appeared in the Miami Daily News of May 31, 1958, and I quote two sentences from it which go to the very heart of the problem now before us:

Now that the House has once again passed the Alaska statehood bill, the Senate should lose no time in doing likewise. * * *

Certainly, the Americans who live in the Territory are entitled to be more than the second-class citizens they have been without statehood.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA STATEHOOD LONG OVERDUE

Now that the House has once again passed the Alaska statehood bill, the Senate should lose no time in doing likewise.

Both Republican and Democratic Parties have repeatedly endorsed statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii in their platforms. Members of Congress who have been elected on those platforms are morally committed to carry them out. Unfortunately, however, the Congressional membership hasn't felt under such obligation in the past.

Eight years ago an Alaska statehood bill passed the House, but died in the Senate. In 1954 the Senate passed a joint Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill, but the House failed to act upon it.

The cases for both Alaska and Hawaii are equally good, but the chances of passage in separate bills appear better. A Senate move to include Hawaii would probably kill the measure for this year.

If the Alaska bill weathers the Senate, our northern Territory will become the 49th State and the first since 1912 to be added to the Union. Arizona was the last to be admitted.

The Alaska bill passed the House with a vote of 208 to 166.

Of the 81 Democrats who voted against the measure, most were from the South. Our own DANTE FASCELL, however, was among those voting for statehood.

In anticipation of being admitted to the Union, Alaska has already chosen two "Senators" and a "Representative." Presumably they will have to be elected again if the bill is passed by the Senate.

Certainly the Americans who live in the Territory are entitled to be more than the second-class citizens they have been without statehood. And if Alaska makes it, the chance for Hawaii will be brighter. Instead of 49 stars the flag may some day have 50.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the second editorial appeared in the Miami Beach Sun of June 5, 1958, and is entitled "History and Alaska." The last paragraph of this editorial reads as follows:

Above all, Alaska is people. Some can remember the roaring Klondike days. Many are imbued with the pioneering spirit that opened up vast reaches of the United States. There are more than 200,000 Alaskans now, double the number before the war. Statehood may boost the population tremendously. More important, statehood will give Alaskans both the responsibilities and the rights and privileges of full citizenship.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY AND ALASKA

Two June days 120 years apart may turn out to have rather special import in the year 1958. The first was June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress adopted a United States flag bearing stripes and stars. The second was June 16, 1897, when news of a fabulous strike in Alaska precipitated the famous gold rush.

These dates are mentioned together because, if the Senate approves a bill already passed by the House, Alaska will become the 49th State in the Union. That constellation which began with 13 stars and grew to 48 during the next 135 years may soon have to be expanded again. If this happens, it will be a victory for the good democratic concept that all citizens should be fairly represented in their Government.

There is much more to Alaska than gold and fisheries and numbing winters. For one thing, Alaska is a vast territory, bigger than Texas, Montana, and California combined. For another, Alaska has great hydroelectric power potential, big forest areas, and fertile land that produces good crops in the warmer southern areas.

Above all, Alaska is people. Some can remember the roaring Klondike days. Many are imbued with the pioneering spirit that opened up vast reaches of the United States. There are more than 200,000 Alaskans now, double the number before the war. Statehood may boost the population tremendously. More important, statehood will give Alaskans both the responsibilities and the rights and privileges of full citizenship.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the third editorial, entitled "More Than Simple Justice," is from the Daytona Beach Journal of May 29, 1958, and I quote briefly from that editorial:

If we do not demonstrate we fully appreciate the desires of our Alaskan Americans for political equality and local self-government, how can we expect colonial peoples of many races and creeds to believe we really sympathize with their longing for independence? . . .

It is worth remembering that no other nation in human history has expanded its territory as the United States has without creating a colonial empire. This has happened because the citizens of the American Union always have been willing to accord to the people in the new territories the same rights and privileges the first American citizens demanded for themselves.

We can't keep Alaska and Hawaii knocking unsuccessfully at our door forever, and still remain the America which has spanned a continent with unbreakable bonds of freedom and brotherhood.

I ask that excerpts from that editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE THAN SIMPLE JUSTICE

The bill to grant statehood to Alaska surmounted its first big hurdle yesterday when it was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 208 to 166.

It now goes to the Senate where its fate will depend on the strength of an opposition coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

This coalition tried to kill the bill in the House but failed. Whether it will succeed in the Senate, only time will tell. But more is at stake in the passage of an Alaskan statehood bill than simple justice to the people of the Alaskan Territory.

A major strength of the United States in the modern world is our traditional antipathy for colonialism. We have the reputation among the colonial peoples of the world of treating the people of dependent territories fairly. We grant them freedom as independent nations or we grant them freedom as full partners in the American union.

However, the vigorous efforts of many Congressmen to block passage of Alaskan statehood bills inevitably tends to be regarded in many parts of the world as evidence that Americans really do not support official United States professions of opposition to all forms of colonialism.

What else can the colonial peoples think if we refuse year after year to grant full citizenship to other Americans who live in our Alaskan Territory? If we do not demonstrate we fully appreciate the desires of our Alaskan Americans for political equality and local self-government, how can we expect colonial peoples of many races and creeds to believe we really sympathize with their longing for independence?

The real reasons Congress has been so reluctant to pass Alaskan statehood bills probably are not known to the colonial and former colonial peoples inclined to believe the worst of western nations that possess large dependent territories.

Perhaps we are fortunate that these reasons are not too widely known. They are no prettier than the reasons the colonial peoples might imagine.

The ostensible reasons given in the opening House debate last week are without much merit. Opponents attacked the Alaskan statehood bill on the grounds its land-grant provisions would constitute a giveaway of natural resources belonging to all the people of the United States. But these statehood opponents are not the Members of Congress who usually fight against giveaways of national resources. Among them are many of the Congressmen who voted to give a few States the valuable offshore oil deposits that belonged to all of the people.

Most of the Congressmen who usually fight to protect national resources are among the supporters of the Alaskan statehood bill. They contend—and quite reasonably it would seem—that Alaska should get title to sizable amounts of Federal land in the territory in order to strengthen the new State financially in its early years.

The argument that Alaska is not contiguous to the existing Union has been made obsolete by modern transportation and communications. The argument that 2 Alaskan Senators would dilute the Senate representation of the more populous States would have prevented the addition of any States to the original 13.

The basic reasons for the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition's opposition to the admission of Alaska as a State are grounded in partisan and racial prejudice.

Most of the Republican opposition is due to the fact that Alaska is an overwhelmingly Democratic Territory. If it becomes a State it will send two Democratic Senators to Washington.

For this reason, Republicans have been reluctant to approve Alaskan statehood without tying it to statehood for traditionally Republican Hawaii. Yet, in recent years, Republican politicians have been having second thoughts even about Hawaii. The reason: The Democrats have been making striking gains in Hawaii.

Hawaii, with a population of more than a half million, has more people than several existing States and several times as many people as Alaska.

On the basis of population alone, Hawaii is entitled to statehood at least as much as Alaska. But several attempts to grant them statehood together have failed. The combination of those who oppose one or the other is too great.

Therefore, the best hope for both seems to lie in separate statehood bills, with Alaska paving the way for its more populous sister Territory. Statehood for Alaska would overcome any feeling that the number 48 is more sacred as far as the number of American States is concerned than the original number 13. The existence of a 49th State would make the addition of the 50th State even easier. But more than this, the admission of Alaska as a member of the American Union would announce to the world that the United States is not standing still, that it still is a vital political community capable of expanding its political sphere without perpetuating colonialism and second class citizenship.

It is worth remembering that no other nation in human history has expanded its territory as the United States has without creating a colonial empire. This has happened because the citizens of the American Union always have been willing to accord to the people in the new territories the same rights and privileges the first American citizens demanded for themselves.

We can't keep Alaska and Hawaii knocking unsuccessfully at our door forever, and still remain the America which has spanned a continent with unbreakable bonds of freedom and brotherhood.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fourth is an editorial from the Pensacola Journal—at the other end of our State—of June 2, 1958, entitled "Alaska Moves Nearer Statehood," the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

Both Territories, however, have progressed far enough to merit admission and both would be valuable additions because of their strategic locations.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA MOVES NEARER STATEHOOD

Admission of Alaska as the 49th State came closer to accomplishment last week when the House of Representatives twice defeated a move to send the bill back to committee and passed it by 208 to 166. This sent it to the Senate where it faces strong opposition from southern Senators.

Both Democratic and Republican platform pledges call for admission of Alaska and Hawaii, but 81 Democrats and 85 Republicans

voted against the bill in the House. President Eisenhower has indicated he will approve the single Alaska bill with the hope that a bill for Hawaii will be enacted later.

Southerners fear admission of the new States will enable Republicans, or rather desegregationists, to upset the balance of power in Congress. The situation, since the Supreme Court ruling, is somewhat akin to the Congressional battle over free and slave State admission prior to the Civil War.

Both Territories, however, have progressed far enough to merit admission and both would be valuable additions because of their strategic locations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fifth editorial is entitled "Statehood for Alaska," which appeared in the Ocala Sunday Star-Banner, June 1, 1953. I quote from it the following:

The reasons set out in the Democratic platform for admitting the two Territories to the Union are more compelling now than they were in 1956. Alaska will be the first point of attack should Russia precipitate another war. That area is vital in our defense system, and by being given the rank and dignity of statehood, Alaska will be able to make even a greater contribution to our first line of defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The lower House of Congress, in a surprising reversal of form, has passed a bill to admit Alaska to statehood. The vote for passage of the bill was 208 to 166. Voting for the bill were 117 Democrats and 91 Republicans. Against it were 81 Democrats and 85 Republicans.

Prior to the vote on passage of the bill, the House had defeated on a voice vote the decision by which it had previously voted tentatively to kill the bill.

Preceding action of the House on the bill President Eisenhower told his news conference he believed Congress should carry out the platform pledges of both parties by voting statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

What did the parties say in their platforms adopted in 1956 about statehood for Alaska and Hawaii? The Republicans briefly said:

"We pledge immediate statehood for Alaska, recognizing the fact that adequate provision for defense requirements must be met. We pledge immediate statehood for Hawaii."

But the Democrats went into more detail in pledging themselves to grant statehood to the two Territories. Here is the platform pledge:

"We condemn the Republican administration for its utter disregard of the rights of statehood of both Alaska and Hawaii. These Territories have contributed greatly to our national economic and cultural life and are vital to our defense. They are part of America and should be recognized as such. We of the Democratic Party, therefore, pledge immediate statehood for these two Territories. We commend these Territories for the action they have taken in the adoption of constitutions which will become effective forthwith when they are admitted into the Union."

The reasons set out in the Democratic platform for admitting the two Territories to the Union are more compelling now than they were in 1956. Alaska will be the first point of attack should Russia precipitate another war. That area is vital in our defense system, and by being given the rank and dignity of statehood, Alaska will be able to make even

a greater contribution to our first line of defense.

Reluctance of some Democrats to admit Alaska stems from the fact that Alaska might elect Republicans to the United States Senate and thus upset the delicate balance of Democratic control there. But that situation could be cured if Hawaii, which probably would elect Democratic Senators, is also admitted to the Union.

It may well be that the Senate, when it takes up the House Alaska statehood bill, will also bring to a vote the bill to admit Hawaii to statehood, which has been on the Senate calendar since last June. In that event, the political scales, possibly, could be held in balance in the Senate so far as the parties are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. The sixth editorial is entitled "Let the People's Will Be Done," from the St. Petersburg Times of May 30, 1958. I quote briefly from the editorial:

Year after year every public opinion poll taken since World War II has shown a huge majority of the people in favor of Alaska's being admitted to the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in part, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE PEOPLE'S WILL BE DONE

After an alarming reversal Tuesday, when a third of the House was absent, the bill for Alaskan statehood again has been passed to the Senate for approval.

If there were a time when Congress knew what the overwhelming public sentiment wanted, it is in regard to this measure.

Year after year every public opinion poll taken since World War II has shown a huge majority of the people in favor of Alaska's being admitted to the Union.

Both parties in their 1956 platforms pledged immediate statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii—the Democrats repeating pledges of 1948 and 1952.

Congress, therefore, has been speaking for nobody but Congress when it has continued to deny admission of the two new States.

Now it is up to the Senate.

Let no one be deceived by any specious excuses made by any Senator who votes against this measure. The people's desire is plain. Let the Senate act accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the seventh and last editorial is entitled Progress Toward Statehood, from the Tampa Tribune of May 24, 1958, and I invite attention to the last paragraph of that editorial which reads as follows:

No new arguments are necessary to justify Alaskan statehood. On grounds of preparation, population, and ability to manage its own affairs, Alaska fully qualifies. Admission of Alaska to the Union would result in no lasting partisan gain to either party, but a successful joint effort would rebound greatly to the credit of both parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS TOWARD STATEHOOD

Seventy-three percent of the persons questioned in a recent Gallup poll favored immediate statehood for Alaska. A pledge of statehood is in the political platforms of both parties. Secretary of the Interior Seaton has spoken earnestly in behalf of statehood. Once again President Eisenhower has asked prompt approval of a measure now

before Congress. Here is a clear instance in which Congress has lagged far behind public opinion.

There is a real hope, however, that the lag will be remedied in this session of Congress.

The first big boost came Wednesday when, by a 217-172 margin, House Members voted to bypass their own Rules Committee and bring the statehood bill directly to the floor. Now, thanks to the support of Speaker Sam Rayburn and other leaders, there is expectation that the House will approve the measure in a fair vote, which may come next week possibly on Wednesday.

If assurance of Senate GOP Leader WILLIAM KNOWLAND and other powerful voices in both parties can be believed, there is similar ground for confidence that the Senate also will have an opportunity to vote and that a majority will approve the bill.

The principal danger is the attempt to tie the Hawaii statehood bill to the Alaska measure. Supporters of statehood for both Territories should realize there is more controversy over Hawaii and that a move to make the one bill contingent upon the other would only play into the hands of those who want to defeat both.

No new arguments are necessary to justify Alaskan statehood. On grounds of preparation, population, and ability to manage its own affairs, Alaska fully qualifies. Admission of Alaska to the Union would result in no lasting partisan gain to either party, but a successful joint effort would rebound greatly to the credit of both parties.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in brief remarks of my own, without reiterating the historical reasons—which have been given fully and which already appear in the RECORD—and the reasons based upon law, I desire to state a few of the reasons why I so strongly favor granting Alaska's long-time request for statehood and making Alaska the 49th State in this wonderful Union of States.

The first point I make is that Alaska badly needs statehood. Alaska has no public lands of her own, but the statehood bill provides that Alaska shall be given an abundant area of public lands, to be selected through joint approval of her governing bodies and proper officials of the United States Government. This is no new procedure. In the case of my own State of Florida, 1 section out of every 36 was given to the State in the beginning for public-school purposes, and many additional sections were given for other purposes. Later, under the Swamp and Overflow Lands Act, the State of Florida received a very large part of its area by way of a grant from the Federal Government. Some of that land has turned out to be some of our richest and most productive land.

Mr. President, that has been the procedure with respect to every State admitted to the Union. The Nation has realized that a part of the stock in trade of a new State is public lands which it can use to attract people and attract investors.

In addition to these grants of public lands, Mr. President, only by the adoption of a constitution of its own as its fundamental law, and by providing a permanent, stable government which will either appeal or not appeal—having examined the constitution of Alaska, I am prepared to say it will appeal greatly—to people to go there and to

capital to be invested there, can an area of this kind extend a permanent invitation to new settlers and new investors.

In addition to the constitution, of course, by the constant enactment of new State laws—as was true in the case of my State—which afford particular and special inducements to people to cast their lot with the State, a great accomplishment can result. Alaska can do as other States have done.

In my opinion, Alaska will speedily create for itself a climate of law favorable to the attraction of many people and of much new industry and new investment.

Mr. President, entirely aside from the fact that Alaska needs statehood, I think the Nation very badly needs Alaska to have statehood. Every bit of the quickened development of Alaska, which I have already mentioned and which will surely follow the grant of statehood, as was the case when every other State was admitted to the Union, will operate to the enrichment and strengthening of our whole nation, and will represent a real, added asset to the Nation as a whole.

We of course must and will defend Alaska, regardless of whether it is a Territory or a State, in the event such a calamity as a great war should again be visited upon the world. I make the point—and it is undoubtedly valid—that a developed State of Alaska with the resources there available, with more people available, and more homes to be defended by more men to defend them, can aid much more powerfully her own immediate defense and her own permanent defense than can Alaska as a Territory. So it is to the interest of the Nation to bring about this quickened development, which will enrich Alaska and also enrich and strengthen the Nation against any test to which it may be subjected.

Mr. President, in the second place let me say that the development of the national wealth and strength will be very greatly increased because of the natural resources which are in Alaska. Already the record is replete with true stories of those resources. Having been to Alaska myself and having checked some of the wealth of that great area, I believe, from personal knowledge, that the development of the great mineral resources of Alaska will add to the wealth and strength of the Nation. The development and use of the tremendous timber resources will also add to the wealth and strength of our Nation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I recall that a year and a half ago when I first became a Member of the Senate, in the opening week of the session the representatives from Alaska who had been elected in accordance with the so-called Tennessee plan came to Washington. It was the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who stood up on the floor of the Senate and graciously introduced to the Senate the representatives the Alaskan people had hopefully sent

to Washington to work in behalf of the cause of statehood. Those representatives were seated in the diplomatic gallery. It was on that day I first learned of the interest and the leadership the distinguished Senator from Florida had shown for years past, and the great contribution he had made, in furthering the cause of statehood for Alaska.

I take this opportunity, on the occasion of the excellent address the Senator from Florida is now making, to commend the Senator for his leadership, and to tell him I take great pride in associating myself with his efforts on behalf of the cause of Alaskan statehood.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Florida will permit me to offer at this point in his address a memorandum which I have received from the Department of the Interior, which is directed to the very subject on which the Senator is now elaborating, namely, the capacity of Alaska to support statehood.

We have heard in the course of this debate many exaggerated statements about how statehood would impose an impossible burden upon the undeveloped economy of Alaska. If one were to listen uncritically to such statements, one might be led to conclude that statehood would drive the Alaskan economy into insolvency and bring ruin upon the people there.

I think this memorandum effectively gives a rebuttal to that argument, in that it shows precisely what the additional costs for statehood would be, and what the additional income to the newly formed State government would be, by virtue of the provisions contained in the pending bill.

The total figures show that the increase in the cost to the people of Alaska by virtue of assuming the responsibilities of State government would be \$6,350,000, over and above the costs which are now assumed under the Territorial government.

On the other hand, the information contained in the memorandum shows that, by virtue of the provisions of the proposed legislation, the newly formed State of Alaska would derive an additional \$5 million in revenue, meaning that the net addition in cost to the people of Alaska, brought about by statehood, would be only \$1,350,000. I think this brings the entire subject into its proper perspective.

With the indulgence and permission of the Senator from Florida, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum from the Department of the Interior be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly accept the inclusion of that memorandum, which I think will add very greatly to the facts shown in the RECORD.

I take this occasion to express my very great gratitude to the Senator from Idaho for his gracious remarks concerning me. I want him to know that my feeling in favor of statehood for Alaska developed following a visit there and seeing for myself not only the resources, but the people, whom I shall mention in a moment.

I was convinced that, while Alaska needs statehood, our Nation needs Alaska

as a State even more. I shall continue to take that position, and I hope that before many hours or days we shall all know that statehood is coming to Alaska in the near future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the memorandum referred to by the Senator from Idaho will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

POPULATION

The official Bureau of the Census estimate for Alaska July 1, 1956, was 206,000. Our current estimate of population for Alaska is 220,000. Of the 220,000, approximately 50,000 are military.

ALASKAN INCOME

In 1957, the gross product from Alaska's natural resources was approximately \$161,846,000. This was an increase of 18 percent over fiscal year 1956. Of this 1957 income, approximately \$92.9 million was derived from fisheries; \$34.3 million from timber; \$24.6 million from minerals; and \$1.5 million from the fur industry, exclusively of the Pribilof fur seal production. The Pribilof production amounted to \$5.2 million.

FEDERAL TAXATION

Alaskans paid about \$65 million in Federal taxes last year, of which \$45 million was paid by Alaskan residents. The balance was derived from nonresidents doing business in Alaska.

GENERAL REVENUE PER CAPITA IN ALASKA

Alaska general revenue was higher than 39 of the existing States in 1957. This per capita revenue compares with other States as follows:

Alabama.....	\$115.9
Alaska.....	161.6
Arkansas.....	106.0
Idaho.....	134.3
Kansas.....	115.3
Mississippi.....	110.8
Vermont.....	140.0
Wyoming.....	224.0
Nebraska.....	90.8
Virginia.....	112.9

ALASKA HAS NO OUTSTANDING DEBT

Alaska had the only government in the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, which had no outstanding debt at the close of fiscal year 1957.

COSTS OF STATEHOOD

Alaska already supports many of the functions needed for a State government. The Federal Government, under the Organic Act, retained jurisdiction over the administration of justice, the Governor's office, and partially supported the legislature and other miscellaneous functions of government. Alaska now has 58 different departments, boards, commissions, and other governmental agencies supported by Territorial appropriations. In the main, the cost of statehood therefore will be the cost to Alaska of assuming the governmental functions now performed by the Federal Government.

This cost will be about \$6,350,000. The breakdown is: \$280,000 for executive and legislative expenses; \$1,800,000 for increased costs for the administration of justice; \$2,750,000 for commercial and sports fisheries and wildlife; and \$1,500,000 for increased highway costs. Offset against this increased cost is approximately \$5 million in new revenues available to Alaska. The net cost of statehood should be about \$1,350,000.

Alaska's growing oil and gas lease income should offset this cost. In addition, this analysis assumes that the State will immediately take jurisdiction over fish and wildlife. Under the present bill, it would not do so and, therefore, the \$2,750,000 assumed additional cost would not be required.

SUMMARY OF STATEHOOD COSTS—EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE

Reduction in Federal costs

The present amount of \$120,000 is annually appropriated for the salaries and office expenses of the Governor, secretary of Alaska, and staff, as well as for the maintenance of the Governor's house. This amount, a Federal appropriation, will reduce the Federal expenditures by \$120,000 per year.

Federal appropriation of \$48,000 is made biennially for pay of legislators. Amounts to reduction of Federal expenditures of \$24,000 per year.

Total Federal expenditures reduction amounts to \$144,000 per year.

Administration of Justice

Judiciary: Estimated present cost is \$385,000 per annum for 4 Federal judges and staffs. At least 1 Federal judge would remain, but estimated reduction in Federal expenditures would be \$235,000 per year.

United States attorneys and United States marshals: Four United States attorneys and four United States marshals undoubtedly would be reduced from present allocation of \$650,000 per year. Continuing expenses necessary to cover regular Federal jurisdiction but reduction in expenditures estimated to be \$450,000 per annum.

Penal institutions: Operations of United States Bureau of Prisons in all of Alaska for both Federal and normal "state" functions at present. Estimated present cost is \$600,000 per year. Transfer of State's portion should result in a reduction in Federal expenditures of \$400,000 per year.

Total Federal reductions per year amounts to \$1,085,000.

Miscellaneous

Commercial fisheries: From a total estimate of \$3,050,000 per year, approximately \$1,850,000 would be needed by the State to cover the expense of management and investigation. Balance, or \$1,200,000 would remain as part of a continuing Federal program activity as elsewhere in the Nation. Annual reduction in Federal expenditures would be \$1,850,000.

Wildlife and sport fisheries: From a total estimate of Federal appropriations in the amount of \$1 million per annum, \$500,000 would be needed by the State to cover the expense of administering the Alaska game law. Balance, or \$500,000 per year, would remain as a part of the continuing Federal programs—such as wildlife refuge predator control, cooperative research, etc. Annual reduction in Federal expenditures would be \$500,000.

Total Federal reductions per year for all fish and wildlife amounts to \$2,350,000.

Highway department: Highway function is now performed by Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Commerce, with allocation of Federal grant funds matched by 10 percent Territorial funds. Assumption is, no change in Federal road aid program as applied to Alaska.

Total reduction in Federal expenditures will be \$3,579,000 yearly.

Additional expenditures for State

No basis for estimating any substantial difference in expenditure. However, will amount to an added expense to the State per year, \$180,000.

State will have to assume pay for legislators. Cost will undoubtedly increase due to State constitution providing for a larger membership. Also, rates of compensation undoubtedly would increase. However, Territory now carries all costs for employees, printing, incidental expenses and compensation for extraordinary sessions. Estimated, \$100,000; total, \$280,000.

Judiciary: Estimated cost of salaries of judges and basic court expenses, based on system outlined in State constitution, \$650,000.

Prosecutors and law-enforcement officers in State system: Territory has borne increasing proportion of basic law enforcement costs recently and now has a well-established State police organization. However, estimated cost for prosecutors, offices and staffs, etc., per annum expected to be \$450,000.

Penal institutions: Estimated cost of necessary penal system plus debt-service on the new courthouses and jails. Yearly, \$700,000.

Total estimated annual increase, \$1,800,000.

Commercial fisheries: This estimated amount, for management and investigation of commercial fisheries annually, would be in addition to what the Territory is now spending. Estimated yearly, \$2 million.

Wildlife and sport fisheries: Basic expenditure for protection and management of wildlife resources. Estimated per year, \$750,000.

Total estimated annual increase for all fish and wildlife, \$2,750,000.

Highway department: Territory would take over operating function. Additional costs estimated for administration by State highway department and for construction and maintenance of local roads not included in program. Estimated additional costs per annum, \$1,500,000.

Total increase in cost of State government, estimated, yearly, \$6,350,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to my friend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Idaho.

The distinguished senior Senator from Florida has been most helpful in connection with the Alaska statehood problem. He has not hesitated to offer his very able assistance in connection with this important bill. I commend him for his objective attitude throughout all the discussion on statehood. As chairman of the Territories Subcommittee, I want the Senate and the country to

know that I appreciate very much that kind of objective attitude.

I should like to point out one further consideration in connection with the financial ability of the proposed new State to take care of its responsibilities. Just 11 months ago we witnessed the first oil strike of any substance in Alaska. A little more than a year ago about 5 million acres were under lease, or applications were pending with respect thereto. The most recent check, in May, showed 32 million acres covered by oil leases or lease applications.

The program involves all the major oil companies and numerous independent oil companies. We have been advised in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where some of the legislation on this subject is handled, that the signs are most hopeful for a tremendous oil development in the area which will become a State.

I add that one point because it will have a tremendous impact on the ability of the new State to provide the essential resources to support itself. This is a factor not indicated in the Secretary's analysis of the ability of the proposed new State to do the job.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution of additional facts; also for his more than generous comments concerning the Senator from Florida.

I was commenting on the assets and resources of Alaska. I believe I mentioned the minerals and the timber. I wish to mention also the agricultural possibilities—many of them in the very same places in which oil development is now taking place, the Kenai Peninsula—and the fisheries, which are without parallel anywhere else in the Nation.

Above everything else, there is the great attraction for tourists and visitors, an attraction which cannot be equaled, in the summertime, anywhere else in the length and breadth of American soil.

I come from a State which during the past year entertained nearly 6 million guests. We are proud of every one of them. We hope that we made their stay worth while by adopting the proper style of hospitality toward them. In Alaska there are values which will beckon to hundreds of thousands of tourists at the beginning, and millions as soon as accommodations and facilities can be created.

The snowcapped mountains, the rapidly flowing streams, cold as ice and teeming with fish, the moose, bear, and all the other wonderful game animals and birds which are found there, the wealth of life of every kind, and the terrain itself, which beggars description, will bring people there literally by the hundreds of thousands.

In company with the new senior Senator-elect from Alaska, former Governor Gruening, I visited one of the many glaciers in Alaska. We stood on the west side. The sun had just come up in the east. The front face of the glacier of solid ice, was about 500 feet high. It was one of the most beautiful sights I have ever seen, from the standpoint of color. The snow on the top did

New Revenues Available to Alaska

Oil and gas leases (90 percent to the State).....	\$3,000,000
Pribilof's income (70 percent to the State).....	1,000,000
Miscellaneous (fines, fees, forfeitures, and 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands).....	500,000
Sports fishing licenses.....	250,000
Forest receipts (from new Sitka operation).....	250,000
Total new revenue available.....	5,000,000

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

not keep the sun from filtering through. Every color imaginable was present, and in addition, there was the purplish-dark blue of the ice itself, which was as hard as rock by reason of the centuries of compression to which it had been subjected.

Mr. President, I lack the words properly to describe the beauties of Alaska; but all those within the sound of my voice will live to see the time when people who have always loved to go to Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Switzerland for the beauties they see there will find even greater beauty closer at hand, in the area of Alaska. I predict that for years Alaska's greatest business may well be tourists.

I must hurry to my conclusion. The third point I wish to make is that I think we owe it to ourselves to create the State of Alaska, and thereby serve our own Nation, because of the people who are there.

They are pioneer people. They are people of the type who conquered the Great Plains of the West, from which came the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who once served as Governor of his State. They are people of the type who went with Lewis and Clark to the area so ably served by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is present. They are the types of pioneers who have always supplied so much of the color, adventure, and romance of our Nation.

A large number of them are now in Alaska, among the estimated 220,000 people who are there. I hope we shall never be without pioneer people in this country. I do not like to think of America without pioneers moving out to untested places in the hope and belief that a finer future awaits them there than that which they could carve out for themselves back home.

We may well be proud of the people of Alaska. They will create a great State. They will be of immeasurable value to our Nation if we only give them their head.

We need men and women of the type who are in Alaska, and we need to encourage them to remain there and build a great State.

I hope our Nation may never become so stymied, so stale, so self-sufficient that it will not put a premium upon the encouragement of pioneers of the rugged, sturdy, fine, ambitious type who are now in Alaska. They should be encouraged to carve out for themselves, their people, and their Nation great values where nature challenges.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this afternoon President Eisenhower signed a bill which will provide increased annuities for thousands of retired civil workers. Personally, I am pleased that the President signed the bill, because this Congress has already passed legislation increasing the pay of military personnel, postal workers, and classi-

fied employees. Therefore, with the signing of the bill this afternoon, Congress and the administration have taken steps which are timely and needed and very helpful to the many millions of people who are either presently employed or have retired.

The bill I introduced, S. 72, during the last session of Congress, was the basis of the legislation which the President signed today. Therefore, I derive some personal satisfaction from the President's action today. I know the increased annuities will be very important to the thousands of people who have suffered because of inflation during the past few years. Those people will be benefited and will be able to enjoy more comfort and ease during their reclining years.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I speak tonight, as I join with many of my colleagues, in support of the passage of the pending bill (H. R. 7999), providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a full and equal sovereign State.

The people of Alaska have adopted and submitted a proposed State constitution, and have taken the other steps necessary for admission, as designated by action of past Congresses. The Alaskan people want statehood; it is only right that they should have it.

I have read with considerable interest and pleasure the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 49, providing statehood for Alaska. The same report, of course, applies to the basic provisions of H. R. 7999. The report outlines the observations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It describes for us the major provisions of the bill and how they apply to the situation of Alaska.

I was particularly impressed with the report in terms of its answers to the arguments which are generally offered in opposition to statehood for Alaska. The report answers all those arguments with meticulous detail and convincingly and persuasively.

Mr. President, the people of Alaska want statehood. They have expressed their desire for statehood again and again by action they have taken, including resolutions which they have adopted, and by referendums which have been held.

In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, I was pleased to note that as far away as New York, interest is being evidenced in the centennial of my own home State, Minnesota. On that date, Representative O'BRIEN, of New York quoted from a New York Times editorial written on the occasion of the Minnesota centennial, substituting the word "Alaska" for "Minnesota," because he felt that the material contained therein was also relevant to the people of Alaska.

I consider it to be a great honor to the State of Minnesota, because many citizens of the Territory of Alaska are

former residents of the State of Minnesota. There is a strong community of interest between our two areas. The Northwest Airlines, which has its home base and home offices at Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., provides transportation from Minnesota to Anchorage, Alaska, and from Anchorage, Alaska, to other parts of the Territory, and overseas to the Orient.

Mr. President, I should like to read this same brief excerpt in order that those of my colleagues in the Senate who have not heard it may do so now. I quote from the editorial:

Alaska is people. They represent the finest part of the pioneer tradition of which we are so proud. They were ready and eager to face a climate that is sometimes less than benign, to work a soil that could be made responsive. They wanted to make a new world in something of the pattern of the old one. They brought with them a dignity, fidelity, and industry that did not brook compromise.

The editorial then continues in what I feel is particularly important for the issue before us now.

I ask Senators to bear in mind that the editorial originally referred to the centennial of the State of Minnesota. As I read it now, the word "Alaska" has been substituted for the word "Minnesota." It is seen that it is every bit as pertinent to the facts with respect to Alaska today as it is with respect to 1858 and Minnesota.

Each one of us may have his own little part of the country to which he is especially devoted. There is no reason to be ashamed of these local prides and loyalties, but there is reason to be gratified by the splendor of regions other than our own; and because we are proud to be Americans, it is good to know that Alaska and its people may be part of us.

The editorial could have been written about any one of the 35 States which came into the Federal Union since the adoption of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Every State would qualify under the terminology and the expressive language and the adjectives of praise which are used in the editorial.

It seems to me that the Alaskan people are Americans in the best tradition. Why, then, should they not be permitted to be Americans officially? It is unfortunate and unjust that they should feel that they are, in the words of Mr. C. W. Snedden, publisher of the Fairbanks News-Miner, "second-class citizens."

Statehood for Alaska would prove a positive force in strengthening the Nation as a whole. From the economic point of view, it is apparent that the great resources of Alaska have not been fully developed during the 88 years of her existence in Territorial status. It is difficult and costly to finance capital investments when many investors do not consider a Territorial government as stable as that of a State.

The committee report on statehood for Alaska sets forth concrete evidence of the possibilities of further capital improvements and expansion in Alaska once it has been granted statehood as

the 49th State of the Union. In fact, considerable investment has already taken place in the Territory of Alaska, and it is to the credit of the Territorial government that the Alaskan budget has been balanced, and that she has shown fiscal responsibility and has proven her willingness and ability to meet her obligations as a Territory at all times. As the report of the committee states, Alaska has established an enviable fiscal position, and the committee deems it axiomatic that the financial responsibility will increase once statehood is granted. It is difficult and costly to finance capital investments, as I have said, and many investors do not consider a Territorial government to be as sound and stable as that of a State. Therefore statehood offers greater economic opportunity.

Moreover, effective policy for furthering the economic growth of a rich area such as Alaska can best be determined by those who are most cognizant of the situation there—in other words, the Alaskans themselves. Their continuous and effective representation in our legislative bodies would be of great aid in enlightened planning to utilize Alaska's resources to their fullest potential, and in a manner which is fair to both the Alaskans and the 48 sister States.

Mr. President, once Alaska has representation in the Senate with its two Senators and in the House of Representatives with its Representatives in accordance with population, then the needs of Alaska in terms of capital investment and in terms of public works and in terms of transportation and commerce will be fully protected and, indeed, fought for and worked for by the elective representatives of the new State.

The eagerness of the Alaskans for statehood indicates, moreover, that they are ready and willing to assume more of their financial responsibility now handled by our Federal Government. If, as seems probable, conferring statehood is instrumental in stimulating economic growth, then clearly Alaska's contribution to the wealth of our Nation will be simultaneously increasing. After all, Mr. President, are we not in some measure presently exercising "taxation without representation"?

I notice that the chart in the report of the committee indicates that a substantial sum of money has been taken from Alaska without voting representation in Congress. The amount totals many millions of dollars. In fact, the appropriations by Congress for Alaska have been less than the taxes collected from Alaska by Congress. Thus Alaska has been paying her way, and even more.

The objection has been raised that statehood for Alaska will mean two Senators for a population of 182,000. That is a very peculiar argument ever to be advanced by fellow Americans, when we consider our history. We should not have to be reminded that many of the present States had even smaller populations at the time of their admission into the Union.

The great State of Idaho, which is so brilliantly represented in the Senate in the movement for statehood for Alaska

by its junior Senator [Mr. CHURCH], had a population of only 88,548 at the time of statehood. Ohio, the great Buckeye State, had a population of only 60,000. Illinois, that great industrial and agricultural State of the Midwest, had a population of only 34,620.

As the committee report on page 11 points out:

The population of Alaska is now greater than was the population of at least 25 States at the time of their admission to the Union. At the date of admission, California had 92,000 inhabitants, Oregon about 50,000, Illinois 34,000, Montana about 140,000, Texas about 200,000, to mention some States that had smaller populations.

The report continues:

Alaska has topped all of the States in percentage population growth since 1940. In 17 years the population has nearly tripled. If history repeats itself the population will increase itself even faster when statehood is attained.

Yet our Founding Fathers saw fit to give all States equal representation in one House of Congress, namely, the Senate, basing membership in the other House on population. I am sure that no Senator would question the importance of the contributions of our colleagues from any of the States I have mentioned. All of those States had smaller populations at the time of statehood than does the Territory of Alaska at this particular day and hour.

Consider, for example, the great State of Nevada. The proportion of population discrepancy between New York State and Nevada, if not now, at least at the time of statehood, is not very different from that which would exist between New York and Alaska.

Another question raised in connection with statehood is that Alaska is not contiguous to the United States. I believe that that argument is answered so completely by the report of the Senate committee that it has lost any possible persuasiveness or any possible logic. The Senate committee report calls this to our attention, for example:

Historically, noncontiguity has never been a requirement nor has it been followed as a precedent. California was admitted in 1850, when some 1,500 miles or more of plains and mountains and wilderness—a wilderness infested by hostile Indians—separated her from the nearest State of the United States. It is interesting to note that some of the very same arguments which were used in the 31st Congress in 1850 against the admission of California, and later Oregon, which was contiguous only to California, are being used against the admission of Alaska.

It does not seem valid to me to utilize the argument as to whether a State is contiguous to the mainland of the United States in this particular period of human history—yes, in this age when communications and transportation have so improved that the only remaining horizons seem to be in outer space. Indeed, in the early days of the Virginia House of Burgesses, the members had to travel 2 or 3 days simply to get to the sessions. That was for the meetings of their State legislature. Today the flying time from Alaska to Washington is less than a day.

As has been pointed out in the debates in the Senate, the modern means of

transportation have made Alaska as close to the other 48 States in the Union as, indeed, was the city of Baltimore to Washington, D. C., back in the year 1790. It is possible to fly from the State of Washington into the Territory of Alaska in a few hours. In the earliest days of this Republic, when communication was by stagecoach, it took an equal period of time to travel the few short miles between Baltimore, Md., and Georgetown or Alexandria, or even Washington, D. C.

The argument as to contiguity or the proximity of Alaska to the mainland of the United States is so ridiculous that it needs only the comment that we are now living in the mid-part of the 20th century, in the atomic, in the jet, in the airplane age. It seems rather foolish to use arguments about Alaska which were the ones used about California 108 years ago. Even those arguments were not persuasive, because California was admitted into the Union.

Alaska is already an invaluable factor in our program for national defense. The Bering Strait, which separates the mainlands of Alaska and Siberia, is only 54 miles wide. All nations of the world may not recognize so clearly as we do that Alaska is an integral part of the Nation. Recognition of Alaskan statehood would be an indisputable evidence of this fact.

The peoples of the free world look to the United States for leadership, and they expect it not only in garrulous and uplifting statements of principle, but also in the cold fact of practice. The United States is a bulwark of the United Nations, dedicated to the principle of aiding non-self-governing nations to develop self-government and heed the political aspirations of their people.

How do we justify our practice of saying "wait a little longer" to 200,000 people who are both eager and qualified for statehood?

Alaska is qualified under the terms of the Constitution, and she is qualified for statehood under the traditional requirements which have been established throughout our history. As the committee report states:

The inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and are sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

That is the first principle for statehood. The second is:

A majority of the electorate desire statehood.

This we know from the referendum in the Territory. The third principle is:

The proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

As to population, the facts have already demonstrated that the population of Alaska is far beyond that of some 25 other States at the time they were admitted into the Union.

As to resources, the resources of Alaska are veritably unlimited. Alaska is one of the great treasure houses of our hemisphere. It is one of the great

sources of continued strength and riches for the United States of America.

So there is no doubt about the ability of Alaska to justify and support State government—self-government.

We cannot afford the taint of charges with respect to delay in granting statehood to Alaska, because, rest assured, our enemies will interpret any delay as a kind of colonialism. Communist tactics will be used in every conceivable way. The Communists will say we are imposing our will on weaker peoples. That argument in itself is not a very important one, but certainly we should come with clean hands before the rest of the world; and today nothing could be more important to our foreign policy than a demonstration by us to the rest of the world that we are willing to include in the Federal Union the Territories of the United States—and, in this instance, the Territory of Alaska.

Therefore, there is a time when we must do more than talk about the ideals we espouse; and that time is now.

So, Mr. President, let us admit Alaska; and let us welcome our 49th sister State with both pride and happiness, as we look forward to her even greater contributions to the Union in the days to come.

Mr. President, in my opinion, one of the most brilliant, eloquent, and moving speeches made in support of statehood for Alaska was delivered some weeks ago in the Senate by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. His speech had packed within it every possible and plausible argument for Alaskan statehood.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act favorably and overwhelmingly on House bill 7999, without so much as touching a semicolon or a comma, because it is now well known that if the bill as passed by the House of Representatives by so great a majority is amended in any way by the Senate, it will be possible for the bill literally to be locked up in one of the Congressional committees, thereby denying a great area, a great Territory, and a great number of people who are citizens of the United States the opportunity of first-class citizenship and the opportunity of equal protection under the laws—namely, the opportunity of statehood.

Mr. President, two alternatives face us: First, to pass the bill, and thereby fulfill a commitment which has been made in Congress year after year, and has been made by both political parties. I understand that considerably more than 3,500 pages of testimony have been taken on the question of Alaskan statehood. I understand that Congress has been discussing Alaskan statehood since 1916. Alaskan statehood has been discussed and discussed and discussed; and finally the people are going to get disgusted unless the Congress gets down to business and permits this Territory to become a sovereign State.

Mr. President, I consider it a really exciting moment in my personal life and in my limited career of public service to speak in behalf of Alaskan statehood. In fact, a personal factor is involved, for my 16-year-old son has repeatedly

said to me, this year, that he hopes Congress will pass a bill making possible Alaskan statehood. I left him only Monday morning; and the last thing he said to me was, "Daddy, don't come home until you've voted for Alaskan statehood." Mr. President, his father is going to try to fulfill that request and that admonition.

That may mean that the debate will be prolonged. But regardless of how long it takes, regardless of what sacrifice may be required, statehood for Alaska is worthy of our attention and of our best efforts.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 25, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1706) to amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 10 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 24), 1958:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, vice Arthur J. Mellott, deceased.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Eva Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1964. She is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1958.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior surgeon

Thomas D. Dublin

To be surgeon

Frank R. Freckleton

To be senior assistant surgeon

Norman C. Telles

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following-named for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be ensigns

Donald B. Clark

Richard L. Hess

Jude T. Flynn

Donald W. Moncevicz

William N. Grabler

George M. Poor

effective June 9,

Ray M. Sundean

1958

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 24), 1958:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. John S. Harnett, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 20: 27: Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.

Eternal God, our Father, we ask in all humility and sincerity to give us this day the wisdom and the courage to discharge faithfully our duties and responsibilities.

May we be glad and grateful for the many opportunities we daily have of serving Thee and our fellow men.

Help us to find our joy in giving our best to the high vocation of gaining for all mankind a better way of life.

Grant that in these days of great national and international problems we may have men and women of vision and devotion who serve for the common good and not for self.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord, who was the servant of all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution expressing indignation at the execution of certain leaders of the recent revolt in Hungary.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11645) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]? [After a pause.]